

2023

CALENDAR YEAR

**JUVENILE  
&  
FAMILY DIVISION**  
ANNUAL REPORT

MISSOURI COURTS  
Judicial Branch of Government



## Table of Contents

<b>Section 1: Missouri’s Youth Population .....</b>	<b>5</b>
Figure 1-1 Youth Population .....	5
Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population.....	5
Figure 1-3 Projected Youth Population by Sex .....	6
Figure 1-4 Projected Youth Population by Sex and Age .....	6
Figure 1-5 Projected Youth Population by Race .....	7
<b>Section 2: Juvenile &amp; Family Division Referrals .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Table 2-1 Source of Referrals.....	9
Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type .....	10
Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex .....	10
Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race .....	11
Table 2-2 Referrals by Age .....	11
Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend .....	12
Figure 2-5 Youth Referral by Sex.....	12
Figure 2-6 Youth Referral by Race .....	13
Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken .....	16
Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome .....	16
<b>Section 3: Law Violation Referrals .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Table 3-1 Source of Law Violations Referrals .....	17
Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level .....	18
Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex.....	18
Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race.....	19
Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age .....	19
Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals .....	20
Table 3-3 Top Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group .....	21
Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken .....	22
Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken .....	22
<b>Section 4: Status Offense Referrals .....</b>	<b>23</b>
Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals .....	23
Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation .....	24
Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex .....	24

Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race.....	25
Table 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age .....	26
Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken .....	27
Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome .....	27
<b>Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals.....</b>	<b>28</b>
Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals .....	28
Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type .....	29
Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex.....	29
Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race.....	30
Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age .....	30
Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken .....	31
Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome .....	31
<b>Section 6: Assessment &amp; Classification.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Figure 6-1 Risk by Level.....	34
Figure 6-2 Risk Level by Sex .....	34
Figure 6-3 Risk Level by Race .....	35
Tables 6-1 Risk Factors.....	36
Tables 6-2 Need Factors.....	38
<b>Section 7: Detention .....</b>	<b>42</b>
Table 7-1 General Youth Population August 31, 2022 .....	43
Figure 7-1 General Admissions by Sex.....	43
Figure 7-2 General Admissions by Race.....	44
Figure 7-3 General Admissions by Sex and Race .....	44
Figure 7-4 General Admissions by Age Group .....	45
Figure 7-5 General Admissions by Sex and Age Group.....	45
Figure 7-6 General Admissions by Race and Age Group .....	46
Figure 7-7 General Average Daily Population by Sex.....	46
Figure 7-8 General Average Daily Population by Race .....	47
Figure 7-9 General Average Daily Population by Sex and Race.....	47
Figure 7-10 General Average Daily Population by Age Group.....	48
Figure 7-11 General Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex.....	48
Figure 7-12 General Average and Median Length of Stay by Race .....	49
Figure 7-13 General Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race .....	49

Figure 7-14 General Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race .....	50
Figure 7-15 General Median Length of Stay by Age Group .....	50
Figure 7-16 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex .....	51
Figure 7-17 Certified Youth Admissions by Race .....	51
Figure 7-18 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Race.....	52
Figure 7-19 Certified Youth Admissions by Age Group .....	52
Figure 7-20 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group .....	53
Figure 7-21 Certified Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group.....	53
Figure 7-22 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex.....	54
Figure 7-23 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Race.....	54
Figure 7-24 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race .....	55
Figure 7-25 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Age .....	55
Figure 7-26 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex.....	56
Figure 7-27 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race.....	56
Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race.....	57
Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race .....	57
Figure 7-29 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Age .....	58
<b>Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments .....</b>	<b>59</b>
Figure 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race.....	59
Figure 8-2 Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group.....	59
Tables 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex, Race, and Age Group .....	60
<b>Section 9: Certification to Adult Court.....</b>	<b>61</b>
Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex .....	61
Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race .....	62
Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age.....	62
Figure 9-4 Certifications Trends by Race .....	63
<b>Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism.....</b>	<b>64</b>
Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population.....	65
Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law).....	65
Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misd A or Felony) .....	66
Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony) .....	66
Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year.....	67
Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex .....	67

Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race .....	68
Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type.....	68
Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age.....	69
<b>Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED).....</b>	<b>70</b>
Table 11-1 Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations.....	72
Table 11-2 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values .....	72
Table 11-3 Statewide Relative Rate Indices.....	73
Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth .....	73
<b>Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload.....</b>	<b>74</b>
Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020) .....	75
Table 12-2 Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload.....	76
<b>Section 13: CA/N Time Standards.....</b>	<b>77</b>
Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely.....	78
<b>Section 14: Juvenile and Family Division Programs and Diversion.....</b>	<b>80</b>
Table 14-1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of Participants.....	82
Table 14-2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants .....	83

## Section 1: Missouri's Youth Population

Section 1 describes the 2022 population of Missouri's youth (ages 5-17).

Figure 1-1 Youth Population

In CY22, Missouri's youth population, ages 5-17, was 1,013,143. This represents roughly a 1.6% decrease from the previous year; and a 0.6% increase from 2018.

Source table 2018: [Population Estimates by Age - 2018 \(data.census.gov\)](https://data.census.gov/PopulationEstimatesbyAge-2018)

Source table 2022: [Population Estimates by Age - 2022 \(data.census.gov\)](https://data.census.gov/PopulationEstimatesbyAge-2022)




Figure 1-2 Projected Youth Population

Population projections, compiled in 2008 for the Missouri youth population, suggested it will decrease until approximately 2015. From 2015-2020, it was projected to have a 3.3% increase. Then, it is projected to continue growing by less than 2% every 5 years, and by 2030 have a total increase of 3.4% from 2020.

Source Table: [Web Formating \(Male and Female Combined\).xls \(mo.gov\)](#)




Figure 1-3 Projected Youth Population by Sex

In CY22, 51% [518,510] of Missouri's youth population was male and 49% [494,633] was female.

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: 2022 \(census.gov\)](#)




Figure 1-4 Projected Youth Population by Sex and Age

In CY22, males outnumbered females across all age groups in Missouri's population of 5-17-year-old youths. The largest age group for males was 15 and the largest for females was 14.

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: 2020-2022 \(census.gov\)](#)




Figure 1-5 Projected Youth Population by Race

Using the population with only one race, the youth population in Missouri is 68% [720,954] White. Black is the second most common race for 5-17 years old at 12% [125,252] followed by youth with two or more races at 11% [118,704], Hispanic at 7% [71,318], Asian/Pacific Islander at 2% [21,676], and Native American at less than 1% [2,750].

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age \(White alone\) \(census.gov\)](#)

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age \(Black alone\) \(census.gov\)](#)


Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age \(Hispanic\) \(census.gov\)](#)

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age \(Asian\) \(census.gov\)](#)

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age \(Hawaiian & Pacific Islander\) \(census.gov\)](#)

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age \(Native American\) \(census.gov\)](#)

Source Table: [State Population by Characteristics: Sex by age \(Two or More Races\) \(census.gov\)](#)





## Section 2: Juvenile & Family Division Referrals

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) define a juvenile and family division referral as *“the initial information provided to the juvenile officer from the referring agency inclusive of the identifying information and basis for the jurisdiction of the juvenile court.”* For the purpose of annual reporting, unless otherwise indicated, disposed referrals represent the unit of measurement, not individual youth. A disposition refers to the outcome or finding of a referral [see pages 13-14] for details about how these dispositions and outcomes are reported in Missouri’s case management systems. In July 2021, the maximum age for referrals raised from 16-17.

The juvenile and family division is responsible for processing and supervising four referral types:

- **Status Offenses:** Status offense referrals include Behavior Injurious to Self/Others, Habitually Absent from Home, Truancy, Beyond Parental Control, and Status-Other. **Note:** The following offenses are also counted as Status Offenses: Juvenile Municipal Ordinance for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product. All other municipal ordinance violations that are explicitly labeled with “JUVMUNI” in the charge code are considered delinquency (<https://www.courts.mo.gov/file.jsp?id=2018>).
- **Law Offenses:** Law offense referrals include all criminal violations listed in the Missouri Charge Code Manual, including infraction and ordinance violations.
- **Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N):** CA/N referrals are allegations of child abuse or neglect where the child is the victim or custody related matters are an issue. Abuse referrals include Abuse-Emotional, Abuse-Incest, Abuse-Other Sexual, and Physical Abuse. Neglect referrals include Abandonment, Neglect-Education, Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision, Neglect-Medical Care, Neglect-Surgical Care, and Neglect-Other. Custody referrals include Abduction, Protective Custody, Transfer of Custody, Termination of Parental Rights, and Relief of Custody.
- **Administrative:** Administrative referrals include Violation of Valid Court Order, Juvenile Informal Supervision/Technical Violation, and Juvenile Formal Supervision/Technical Violation. Counts of Administrative referrals throughout this report include these additional violations: Prob / Parole Violation and Probation Violation (Municipal Ordinance). While not sanctioned for use on juvenile referrals, circuits have used these charge codes in calendar year 2023.

Section 2 presents information on disposed referrals at the state level for the juvenile and family division in calendar year 2023.

Table 2-1 Source of Referrals

Referrals to Missouri’s juvenile and family division originate from a variety of sources. In CY23, 53% of all referrals originated from some type of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [41%]. The Children’s Division of Missouri’s Department of Social Services accounted for 18% of all referrals. An additional 18% of referrals occurred at schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer).

Missing Data [407]

<b>Source of Referral</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Municipal Police	17,851	41.1%
Children’s Division	7,334	16.9%
County Sheriff	5,023	11.6%
School Personnel	4,928	11.3%
School Resource Officer	2,927	6.7%
Parent	1,763	4.1%
Juvenile Court Personnel	1,716	3.9%
Other	566	1.3%
Other Juvenile Court	477	1.1%
Other Law Enforcement	413	1.0%
Highway Patrol	211	0.5%
Other Relative	72	0.2%
Public Social Agency	71	0.2%
Private Social Agency	70	0.2%
Victim or Self	39	0.1%
Department of Mental Health	6	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>43,467</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 2-1 Referrals by Referral Type

In CY23, a total of 43,874 referrals were disposed. The largest percentage [41%, 17,950] was for delinquency allegations. The rest of the referrals were divided between abuse/neglect allegations [27%, 11,802], status offenses [31%, 13,360], and administrative offenses [2%, 762].

Missing Data [0]

**Note:** Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are considered status offenses.




Figure 2-2 Referrals by Sex

For all the disposed referrals in CY23, males accounted for 60% [26,466] and females for the remaining 40% [17,301].

Missing Data [6]




Figure 2-3 Referrals by Race

Approximately, 68% [29,304] of all disposed referrals were for White youth. The second largest percentage of referrals were 28% [12,208] for Black youth. The remaining groups were Hispanic youth which accounted for 2.6% [1,100], Asian/Pacific Islander youth which accounted for 0.7% [293], and Native American youth which accounted for 0.3% [142].

Missing Data [827]

**Note:** Missing Data includes the Unknown race option




Table 2-2 Referrals by Age

Those under 10 years of age, represented 17.6% [7,698] of all referrals. Youth aged 16, accounted for the next largest proportion of referrals, [16.6%, 7,269], followed by youth aged 15, [15.5%, 6,795] and youth aged 17 or older [14.8%, 6,481].

Missing Data [15]

Age	Frequency	Percentage
<10	7,698	17.6%
10	1,026	2.3%
11	1,521	3.5%
12	2,652	6.0%
13	4,301	9.8%
14	6,116	13.9%
15	6,795	15.5%
16	7,269	16.6%
> = 17	6,481	14.8%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>43,859</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 2-4 Youth Referral Trend

The total number of disposed referrals declined by 28% from 2012 to 2023. The trend shows the greatest decrease in administrative referrals (-45%). All other referral types decreased: status referrals (-14%), CA/N referrals (-31%), and delinquency referrals (-33%) over that period. Since last year, there was a decrease in CA/N referral types (-6%), and administrative (-10%). There was an increase in all other case types: delinquency (4%), and status (4%).




Figure 2-5 Youth Referral by Sex

Disposed referrals declined more for females (-29%) than for males (-26%) from 2012 to 2023. Between 2022 and 2023, the number of referrals for males increased by 0.7% and the number of referrals for females increased by 1.1%.





Figure 2-6 Youth Referral by Race

From 2012-2023, disposed referrals increased for Native American youth (27.9%), and Asian/Pacific Islander youth (27.9%). Disposed referrals decreased for White youth (-31.7%), Black youth (-24.3%), and Hispanic youth (-15.6%)

**Note:** Asian/Pacific Islander and Native American youth are not displayed to maintain readability.



## Referral Outcomes

The juvenile and family division will respond to referrals either through a formal or informal process. Through the formal process, a juvenile officer files a petition in the juvenile and family division to have a judge hear and determine the outcome of the allegations contained in the petition. Through the informal process, a juvenile officer determines the outcome of the allegations contained in the referral without filing a petition seeking formal judicial jurisdiction. The following referral outcomes are recorded on the ***Site Defined (COASITE)*** form when a VDYS (DYS Data) docket code is entered on the ***Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)*** form in Judicial Information System (JIS).

### Formal Outcomes:

- **Allegation True, Youth Receives Out-of-Home Placement** – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth is placed out-of-home with the Division of Youth Services (DYS), in foster care, with a relative, or with a private or public agency.
- **Allegation True, Youth Receives In-Home Services** – A judicial action finding the allegation true. Youth receives services while remaining in his or her home. This outcome requires the youth to receive supervision through the juvenile division.
- **Allegation True, No Services** – A judicial action finding the allegation true; however, the youth receives no services or supervision.
- **Allegation Not True** – A judicial action which results in the termination of a juvenile case during the initial juvenile division hearing because the allegation is found not true.
- **Sustain Motion to Dismiss** – A judicial action which results in a motion to dismiss the petition before the initial division hearing.
- **Juvenile Certified – Felony Allegation** - A judicial action sustaining a motion to dismiss a petition to the juvenile division and allow prosecution of youth under the general law.

## Informal Outcomes:

- **Informal Adjustment without Supervision:** Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and does not involve supervision of youth. Although services may be monitored, this disposition does not include direct supervision of a youth in accordance with the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. However, because the disposition is applied on the basis of an informal adjustment conference, completion of the mandated risk and needs assessments is required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.
- **Informal Adjustment with Supervision:** Any informal non-judicial activity that occurs without the filing of a petition and involves supervision of youth by written agreement and complies with Missouri Supreme Court Rules for an informal adjustment conference and the relevant contact standards contained in the Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards. This disposition requires completion of the risk and needs assessment when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.
- **Informal Adjustment – No Action:** Any informal non-judicial activity that entails no more than brief face-to-face, telephone, or warning letter with the intent to inform, counsel, and warn the youth and/or family regarding a referral received. No official informal adjustment conference, per Supreme Court Rule is held; therefore, completion of the mandated risk or needs assessments is not required when the referral is for a status or delinquency allegation.
- **Transfer to Other Juvenile Division:** A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another juvenile division for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.
- **Transfer to Other Agency:** A non-judicial activity where a youth's case file and associated records are transferred to another agency (CD, DMH, DYS, or other public or private agency) for disposition. Depending on when this disposition is applied, an official informal adjustment conference and associated assessments may or may not occur.
- **Referral Rejected:** The referral is rejected because there is insufficient information for administrative action to proceed or the referral is found not true. No informal adjustment conference is conducted and no assessments are required.



Figure 2-7 Youth Referrals by Action Taken

In CY23, 76% [33,380] of all referrals were disposed through the informal process. Only 22% [9,736] of referrals required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing disposition information.

Missing Data [566]

**Youth Referrals by Action Taken**





Figure 2-8 Youth Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment – No Action [19.5%, 8,397] was the most frequently used informal finding, and the most frequently used formal finding was Allegation Found True with Out-of-Home Placement [13.6%, 5,883].

Missing Data [758]

\*Formal outcomes

**Total Referrals by Outcome**



## Section 3: Law Violation Referrals

Section 3 describes law violation referrals disposed by Missouri's juvenile and family division. Law violation referrals made up 41% of all referrals disposed in calendar 2023. A law violation referral is counted as a single delinquent act represented by the most serious allegation charged (misdemeanor or higher). However, multiple delinquent acts may be associated with a single referral.

**Note:** Infractions and municipal ordinances are included under law violations. Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are listed under status offenses.

Table 3-1 Source of Law Violations Referrals

The source of 85% of law violation referrals was some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [66.6%] and county sheriff departments [15.8%]. Schools were the second highest referring agency [12.5%] (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined).

Missing Data [168]

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Municipal Police	11,840	66.6%
County Sheriff	2,805	15.8%
School Resource Officer	1,839	10.3%
School Personnel	393	2.2%
Other Law Enforcement	256	1.4%
Highway Patrol	164	0.9%
Other Juvenile Court	160	0.9%
Juvenile Court Personnel	135	0.8%
Children's Division	116	0.7%
Parent	31	0.2%
Public Social Agency	21	0.1%
Other	16	0.1%
Other Relative	4	0.0%
Victim or Self	1	0.0%
Private Social Agency	1	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,782</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 3-1 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level

The most common charge level for law referrals was misdemeanor [62.6%, 11,226] with Class A misdemeanors accounting for the largest amount [34.8%, 6,253]. Felonies represented 33.3% of law referrals, with Class D being the most common type of felony referral [14.8%, 2,655]. Roughly five percent of all law violations were for Class A and B felonies [445 & 470].

Missing Data [0]




Figure 3-2 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Sex

Law violations at the misdemeanor level were the most common allegation for both male and female offenders. However, within sex, the percentage of referrals for misdemeanors was higher for females [72%, 3,774] than for males [59%, 7,429]. Conversely, males were referred at a higher rate [38%, 4,777] for felonies than were females [23%, 1,195].

Missing Data [34]




Figure 3-3 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Race

Misdemeanor was the most common charge among all race categories. As a percentage, felony referrals were higher for youth of color, than for Asian/Pacific Islander youth and White youth: Black youth [42%, 2,764], Native American youth [39%, 13], Hispanic youth [33%, 142], White youth [28%, 2,994], Asian/Pacific Islander youth [23%, 20].

Missing Data [166]




Figure 3-4 Law Violation Referrals by Charge Level and Age

Youth aged 17 and older were responsible for the largest number of misdemeanors [2,410]. Youth aged 17 and older accounted for the largest number of felonies [1,703]. Youth under 10 were proportionally the most likely to commit misdemeanors (81%, 172), while youth aged 17 and older were proportionally the most likely to commit felonies [40%, 1,703].

Missing Data [7]




Table 3-2 Top Law Violation Referrals

Violations for Assault, Property Damage, Stealing, Dangerous Drugs, and Peace Disturbance accounted for the majority [69%] of major allegations on law referrals. The Top 5 Law Violations remain unchanged from the previous year. According to *Juvenile Court Statistics 2021* report published by the National Center for Juvenile Justice, assault was also the most common offense for juveniles in the United States. Following assault, the next highest number of cases handled by juvenile courts nationwide were obstruction of justice and then followed by larceny-theft. Missing Data [0] **Note:** Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are considered status offenses.

Top Law Violations	Frequency	Percentage
Assault	5,095	28.4%
Property Damage	2,494	13.9%
Stealing	2,166	12.1%
Dangerous Drugs	1,367	7.6%
Peace Disturbance	1,341	7.5%
Sexual Assault	730	4.1%
Invasion of Privacy	563	3.1%
Liquor Laws	543	3.0%
Weapons	436	2.4%
Burglary	434	2.4%
Obstructing Police	417	2.3%
Municipal Charges	355	2.0%
Threats	344	1.9%
Robbery	264	1.5%
Health And Safety	261	1.5%
Obscenity	253	1.4%
Motor Vehicle Violations	159	0.9%
Sex Offenses	156	0.9%
Obstruct Jud Proc	112	0.6%
Public Order Crimes	81	0.5%
Homicide	76	0.4%
Arson	65	0.4%
Fraud	55	0.3%
Stolen Property	41	0.2%
Conservation	30	0.2%
Family Offenses	29	0.2%
Forgery	23	0.1%
Flight/Escape	21	0.1%
Juvenile Offenses	17	0.1%
Other	12	0.1%
Kidnapping	10	0.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,950</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 3-3 Top Law Violation Referrals by Major Allegation and Age Group

Forty percent of all juvenile law violation referrals were committed by youth aged 15 and 16. These youth were responsible for 41% of homicides, 44% of drug charges, 45% of liquor law violations, 46% of robberies, and 42% of stealing referrals. Threats, forgery and municipal charges, juvenile offenses, and obscenity were committed at a higher rate by youth 13-14. Missing Data [7]

**Note:** Juvenile municipal ordinances for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are considered status offenses.

Major Allegation/Age	<10	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	>=17	Total
Assault	84	71	185	428	614	915	895	977	924	5,093
Property Damage	31	26	44	125	212	427	511	567	550	2,493
Stealing	7	9	37	83	185	315	392	522	616	2,166
Dangerous Drugs	1	3	8	39	109	212	260	344	390	1,366
Peace Disturbance	28	16	48	89	174	244	253	246	243	1,341
Sexual Assault	19	9	15	26	63	127	128	118	222	727
Invasion of Privacy	7	3	13	33	59	77	114	124	133	563
Liquor Laws	1	0	3	15	21	41	98	144	220	543
Weapons	4	8	7	22	26	38	78	118	135	436
Burglary	3	3	17	15	33	59	90	96	118	434
Obstructing Police	0	0	2	16	26	49	88	117	119	417
Municipal Charges	3	4	7	19	51	60	52	74	85	355
Threats	12	8	26	35	68	67	57	44	27	344
Robbery	1	2	0	5	12	30	47	74	93	264
Health and Safety	1	0	2	21	33	44	53	57	50	261
Obscenity	0	2	11	24	52	63	45	27	29	253
Motor Vehicle Violations	0	0	0	3	8	18	15	35	80	159
Sex Offenses	4	3	6	11	17	27	20	25	43	156
Obstruct Jud Proc	1	0	0	0	7	12	24	29	39	112
Public Order Crimes	0	0	2	1	4	13	21	23	17	81
Homicide	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	23	37	76
Arson	3	4	1	7	8	8	11	12	11	65
Fraud	0	0	1	3	2	9	12	14	14	55
Stolen Property	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	8	16	41
Conservation *	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	10	11	30
Family Offenses	2	2	0	2	2	1	1	12	7	29
Forgery	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3	10	23
Flight/Escape	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	21
Juvenile Offenses	0	0	0	3	2	9	3	0	0	17
Other	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	5	12
Kidnapping	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>1,026</b>	<b>1799</b>	<b>2,883</b>	<b>3,293</b>	<b>3,858</b>	<b>4,264</b>	<b>17,943</b>

Figure 3-5 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken

Eighty-two percent [14,705] of law violation referrals were disposed through the informal adjustment process. Sixteen percent [2,949] required formal court intervention. Remaining cases are missing outcome information.

Missing Data [296]





Figure 3-6 Law Violation Referrals by Action Taken

The most frequently used methods of disposing law violation referrals were Referral Rejected [20.3%, 3,582] and Informal Adjustment No Action [19.5%, 3,449]. Allegation Found True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [9.0%, 1,593], followed by Allegation Found True-Out-of-Home Placement [4.0%, 712]. Only 0.5% [92] of referrals resulted in petitions for Certification to Adult Court.

Missing Data [296]

\*Formal outcomes



## Section 4: Status Offense Referrals

Section 4 describes status offense referrals disposed by the juvenile and family division. Status offense referrals made up 30% of all referrals in calendar 2023. A status violation referral is counted as a single behavioral act represented by the most serious allegation charged. However, multiple status offense acts may be associated with a single referral. Juvenile Municipal Ordinance violations for Curfew and Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product are considered Status offenses.

Table 4-1 Source of Status Offense Referrals

Forty nine percent of status violation referrals originated from some form of law enforcement agency (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement), primarily municipal police [36%] and county sheriff departments [12%]. Schools [36%] were the second highest referring agency (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined), followed by parents [7%] and Children's Division [3%].

Missing Data [17]

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Municipal Police	4,806	36.0
School Personnel	3,780	28.3
County Sheriff	1,631	12.2
School Resource Officer	1,015	7.6
Parent	883	6.6
CD	459	3.4
Juv Court Personnel	414	3.1
Other Law Enforcement	80	0.6
Other Juv Court	79	0.6
Other	64	0.5
Other Relative	44	0.3
Highway Patrol	35	0.3
Public Social Agency	28	0.2
Victim or Self	16	0.1
Private Social Agency	7	0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,343</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



Figure 4-1 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation

Behavior Injurious to Self or Others [41%, 5,447] was the most frequent status offense for which youth were referred, followed by Truancy [21%, 2,852]. Muni-Curfew and Muni-Possession/Use Of A Tobacco Product constitutes less than 3% of status offense referrals.




Figure 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Sex

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common allegation for both males [44%, 3,330] and females [36%, 2,102]. Proportionally, females were more likely than males to be referred for Truancy and Habitually Absent from Home. Beyond Parental Control was proportionally the same amongst male [14%, 1,079] and female youth [14%, 824].

Missing Data [30]




Table 4-2 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Race

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common reason to be referred for White youth [44%, 4,223], Black youth [33%, 978], Hispanic youth [39%, 146] and Asian/Pacific Islander youth [46%, 18]. Native American [43%, 44] youth were most referred for Truancy.

Missing Data [187]

**Note:** Missing Data includes the Unknown race option

<b>Allegation /Race</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>	<b>Asian/ Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Native American</b>	<b>Total</b>
Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	4,223	978	146	18	30	5,395
Truancy	2,084	510	111	14	44	2,763
Habitually Absent From Home	1,339	957	53	3	7	2,359
Beyond Parental Control	1,501	327	51	2	7	1,888
Status Offense - Other	340	75	7	0	1	423
Muni - Curfew	137	104	2	2	2	247
Muni- Possession / Use Of A Tobacco Product	77	8	1	0	12	98
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,701</b>	<b>2,959</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>13,173</b>

Table 4-3 Status Offense Referrals by Allegation and Age

Behavior Injurious to Self/Others was the most common type of referral for youth of all ages. Youth aged younger than 10 were the group most often referred for Truancy [32%, 192]. The youth 17 or older were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Habitually Absent from Home [25%, 411]. Also, youth aged 10 years old were proportionally more likely to be referred for being Beyond Parental Control [21%, 60].

Missing Data [3]

<b>Allegation/Age</b>	<b>&lt;10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>&gt;=17</b>	<b>Total</b>
Behavior Injurious to Self/Others	308	150	243	447	731	931	977	921	738	5,446
Truancy	192	44	132	233	392	519	589	587	164	2,852
Habitually Absent from Home	18	19	45	116	302	466	486	510	411	2,373
Beyond Parental Control	76	60	97	185	251	342	334	365	196	1,906
Status Offense - Other	12	7	18	37	36	68	97	73	81	429
Muni - Curfew	0	0	1	9	27	38	70	63	44	252
Muni- Possession / Use of A Tobacco Product	0	2	1	7	14	18	15	24	18	99
<b>Total</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>1,034</b>	<b>1,753</b>	<b>2,382</b>	<b>2,568</b>	<b>2,543</b>	<b>1,652</b>	<b>13,357</b>

Figure 4-4 Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken

The vast majority of status offense referrals [93%, 12,448] were disposed through the informal process, leaving only 7% [881] to be disposed through the formal court process. Remaining cases are missing outcome information.

Missing Data [31]

**Status Offense Referrals by Action Taken**





Figure 4-5 Status Offense Referrals by Outcome

Informal Adjustment, No Action [30%, 3,985] was the most frequently used method for disposing status referrals, followed by Informal Adjustment without Supervision [22%, 2,866]. Allegation True with In-Home Services was the most frequently applied formal outcome [3%, 433].

Missing Data [31]

\*Formal outcomes

**Status Offense Referrals by Outcome**



## Section 5: Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals

Section 5 describes child abuse and neglect (CA/N) referrals disposed by Missouri's juvenile and family division. CA/N referrals made up 27% of all referrals in calendar 2023. A CA/N referral is counted as a single event, represented by the most serious allegation where a youth is the victim. However, a youth may be the victim of multiple incidences of abuse and/or neglect at the time at which they are referred.

Table 5-1 Source of CA/N Referrals

Roughly 58% of all CA/N referrals are from Children's Division (CD) of Missouri's Department of Social Services (DSS). Law enforcement agencies (Municipal Police, County Sheriff, Highway Patrol, and Other Law Enforcement) were responsible for 15% of the referrals. Approximately 7% of the referrals originated from schools (School Personnel and Resource Officer combined).

Missing Data [191]

Source of Referral	Frequency	Percentage
Children's Division	6,748	58.1%
Municipal Police	1,032	8.9%
Parent	847	7.3%
School Personnel	720	6.2%
Juvenile Court Personnel	686	5.9%
County Sheriff	581	5.0%
Other	479	4.1%
Other Juvenile Court	232	2.0%
Other Law Enforcement	76	0.7%
School Resource Officer	70	0.6%
Private Social Agency	60	0.5%
Other Relative	24	0.2%
Public Social Agency	21	0.2%
Victim or Self	21	0.2%
Highway Patrol	12	0.1%
Department of Mental Health	2	0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,611</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 5-1 CA/N Referrals by Allegation Type

Neglect-Improper Care/Supervision represented [44%, 5,195] most of all CA/N referrals, followed by Neglect-Other [16%, 1,831], and Abuse-Physical [9%, 1,073]

Missing Data [0]




Figure 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Sex

Within sex, the percentage of neglect related referrals were higher for males [71%, 4,082] than for females [67%, 4,018]. Conversely, referrals for abuse were greater for females [22%, 1,328] compared with their male counterparts [17%, 954].

Missing Data [40]




Table 5-2 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Race

Neglect was the most common type of referral for all youth [69%, 7,776]. Proportionately, White youth were the most likely group to be referred for abuse [21%, 1,765].

Missing Data [470]

**Note:** Missing Data includes the Unknown race option

<b>Race/Allegation</b>	<b>Juvenile Abuse</b>	<b>Juvenile Custody</b>	<b>Juvenile Neglect</b>	<b>Total</b>
White	1,765	965	5,845	8,575
Black	390	326	1,613	2,329
Hispanic	53	25	205	283
Native American	9	3	42	54
Asian/Pacific Islander	18	2	71	91
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,235</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>7,776</b>	<b>11,332</b>

Table 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Allegation and Age

The vast majority of abuse, neglect, and custody referrals were for youth younger than 10 [58%, 6,877].

Missing Data [5]

<b>Age/Allegation</b>	<b>Juvenile Abuse</b>	<b>Juvenile Custody</b>	<b>Juvenile Neglect</b>	<b>Total</b>
< 10	989	842	5,046	6,877
10	103	54	414	571
11	114	43	388	545
12	150	53	369	572
13	204	62	424	690
14	194	97	431	722
15	227	99	430	756
16	192	80	395	667
>= 17	115	60	222	397
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,288</b>	<b>1,390</b>	<b>8,119</b>	<b>11,797</b>

Figure 5-3 CA/N Referrals by Action Taken

Fifty-one percent of CA/N referrals were disposed through the informal court process [5,829]. Forty-nine percent [5,608] of referrals were handled through the formal court process. The remainder were missing data.

Missing Data [365]

**Action Taken for Child Abuse & Neglect Referrals**





Figure 5-4 CA/N Referrals by Outcome

Allegation True, Out-of-Home Placement was the most frequently applied outcome [41%, 4,788] to CA/N referrals, followed by Transfer to Other Agency [17%, 1,840], and Referral Rejected [14%, 1,674]

Missing Data [365]

\*Formal outcomes

**Child Abuse and Neglect Referrals by Outcome**





## Section 6: Assessment & Classification

In 1995, the Missouri General Assembly passed the Juvenile Crime and Crime Prevention Bill [HB 174]. The bill was aimed at reshaping Missouri's juvenile justice system through the development of a comprehensive juvenile justice strategy. As part of the strategy, the Office of State Courts Administrator was charged with coordinating an effort to design and implement a standardized assessment process for classifying juvenile offenders. The result of this effort was the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System.

The Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification System includes an empirically validated risk assessment for estimating a youthful offender's relative likelihood of future delinquency and a classification matrix that links the level of risk and offense severity to a recommended set of graduated sanctions. The system also includes a needs assessment for identifying the underlying psychosocial needs of youth.

Since its inception, the Missouri Juvenile Offender Classification system has helped Missouri's juvenile justice professionals to ensure public safety and promote statewide consistency in the services and supervision of youthful offenders.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) sections 2.6 Risk Assessment and 2.7 Needs Assessment mandates the juvenile officer complete a Missouri Juvenile Officer Risk Assessment and Missouri Juvenile Officer Needs Assessment on "all juveniles with a legally sufficient referral for a delinquent or status offense if an informal adjustment conference was conducted, or the matter was subject to adjudication." Subsequent risk assessments are to be completed "if the juvenile receiving services is subject to a new delinquent or status offense referral, and additional sanctions or services will be required." Subsequent needs assessments are to be completed "upon significant changes in the juvenile's circumstances or every 90 days as an indicator of progress toward the supervision or treatment goals."

Section 6 presents information on juveniles with referrals who were disposed during calendar 2023, and who had risk and needs assessments entered on the ***Custom Assessment Maintenance (CZAASMT)*** form of JIS. When a referral has more than one associated risk/needs assessment(s), the highest score is reported. When a referral is not associated with any risk/needs assessment(s) in the reporting year, the score associated with the risk/needs assessment that was completed on the nearest date before or after the initial filing date of the referral is the one that is reported, regardless of the year the assessment was completed. Figures 6-1 to 6-3 provide risk level information with Tables 6-1 and 6-2 providing information about the prevalence of individual risk and need factors. \*\*

*\*\*Readers should refer to [Missouri's Juvenile Offender Risk & Needs Assessment and Classification System Manual \(2005\)](#) for the operational definitions of risk and needs factors.*

Figure 6-1 Risk by Level

The majority of youth [62%, 7,301] scored at moderate risk for future delinquent acts on risk assessments in CY23. The remaining youth scored at low [23%, 2,720] or high-risk levels [16%, 1,839].

Missing Data [0]




Figure 6-2 Risk Level by Sex

Proportionately, more male youth [17%, 1,317] were assessed high risk than females [13%, 519]. Females [64%, 2,531] were more likely than their male counterparts [60%, 4,753] to be assessed moderate risk. Low Risk equally assessed amongst male [23%, 1,795] and females [23%, 915]

Missing Data [30]





Figure 6-3 Risk Level by Race

Proportionately, more Black youth [21%, 601] were assessed high risk than White youth [14%, 1,179]. White youth [24%, 2,036] were more likely than their Black counterparts [19%, 541] to be assessed low risk.

Missing Data [118]



## Tables 6-1 Risk Factors

Missing [28]

<b>Age at First Referral</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
12 and under	3,980	33.6
13	1,785	15.1
14	2,014	17.0
15	1,790	15.1
16	2,291	19.3

<b>Prior Referrals</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
None	5,286	44.6
One or more	6,574	55.4

<b>Assault Referrals</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No prior or present referrals for assault	8,266	69.7
One or more prior or present referrals for misdemeanor assault	2,771	23.4
One or more prior or present referrals for felony assault	823	6.9

<b>History of Placement</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No prior out-of-home placement	8,192	69.1
Prior out-of-home placement	3,668	30.9

<b>Peer Relationships</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Neutral influence	6,376	53.8
Negative influence	4,401	37.1
Strong negative influence	1,083	9.1

<b>History of Child Abuse/Neglect</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No history of child abuse/neglect	8,633	72.8
History of child abuse/neglect	3,227	27.2

<b>Substance Abuse</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	8,284	69.8
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	3,108	26.2
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	468	3.9

<b>School Attendance/Disciplinary</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No or only minor problems	5,119	43.2
Moderate problems	4,821	40.6
Severe problems	1,920	16.2

<b>Parental Management Style</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Effective management style	5,693	48.0
Moderately effective management style	4,783	40.3
Severely ineffective management style	1,384	11.7

<b>Parental History of Incarceration</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No prior incarceration	8,397	70.8
Prior incarceration	3,463	29.2

## Tables 6-2 Need Factors

Missing [230]

<b>Behavior Problems</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No significant behavior problem	4,394	37.8
Moderate behavior problem	5,364	46.1
Severe behavior problem	1,761	15.1

<b>Attitude</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Motivated to change/accepts responsibility	7,491	64.4
Generally uncooperative, defensive, not motivated to change	3,184	27.4
Very negative attitude, defiant, and resistant to change	844	7.3

<b>Interpersonal Skills</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Good interpersonal skills	7,130	61.3
Moderately impaired interpersonal skills	3,849	33.1
Severely impaired interpersonal skills	540	4.6

<b>Peer Relationships</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Neutral influence	6,226	53.5
Negative Influence	4,238	36.4
Strong negative Influence	1,055	9.1

<b>History of Child Abuse/Neglect</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No history child abuse/neglect	8,313	71.5
History of child abuse/neglect	3,206	27.6

<b>Mental Health</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No mental health disorder	7,155	61.5
Mental health disorder with treatment	3,422	29.4
Mental health disorder with no treatment	942	8.1

<b>Substance Abuse</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No alcohol or drug abuse problem is apparent	8,077	69.5
Moderate alcohol and/or drug abuse problem	3,006	25.9
Severe alcohol and/or drug abuse/dependence	436	3.7

<b>School Attendance</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No or only minor problems	5,021	43.2
Moderate problems	4,608	39.6
Severe problems	1,890	16.3

<b>Academic Performance</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Passing without difficulty	6,011	51.7
Functioning below average	3,658	31.5
Failing	1,850	15.9

<b>Learning Disorder</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No diagnosed learning disorder	9,795	84.2
Diagnosed learning disorder	1,724	14.8

<b>Employment</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Full-time employment	781	6.7
Part-time employment	875	7.5
Unemployed	1,601	13.8
Not Applicable	8,262	71.1



<b>Juvenile's Parental Responsibility</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No children	11,136	95.8
One child	233	2.0
Two children	74	0.6
Three or more children	60	0.5

<b>Health/Handicaps</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No health problems or physical handicaps	11,072	95.2
No health problems/handicaps but limited access to health care	122	1.0
Mild physical handicap or medical condition	271	2.3
Pregnancy	14	0.1
Serious physical handicap or medical condition	40	0.3

<b>Parental Management Style</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Effective management style	5,521	47.5
Moderately ineffective management style	4,646	40.0
Severely ineffective management style	1,352	11.6

<b>Parental Mental Health</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No parental history of mental health disorder	9,007	77.5
Parental history of mental health disorder	2,512	21.6

<b>Parental Substance Abuse</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
No parental substance abuse	8,742	75.2
Parental substance abuse	2,777	23.9

<b>Social Support System</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strong social support system	6,038	51.9
Limited support system, with one positive role model	4,471	38.5
Weak support system; no positive role models	858	7.4
Strong negative or criminal influence	152	1.3

## Section 7: Detention

Missouri's juvenile and family division of the circuit court includes 18 detention facilities to house youth in need of secure detention. Juvenile justice personnel identify offenders most in need of secure detention using the objective criteria contained in Missouri's Juvenile Detention Assessment (JDTA). In addition, 17 detention centers participate in the Annie Casey Foundation Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) [highlighted in table 7-1] for calendar 2023. [The 32nd circuit also participates in JDAI, but does not have detention centers.] JDAI is an effort to assist the juvenile and family division with the development and use of community-based alternatives to secure detention when detention is determined to be unnecessary or inappropriate. The initiative emphasizes the collection and application of objective data to identify practices that may contribute to over-utilization of secure detention, detention overcrowding, and disproportionate minority confinement. On February 18, 2014 the Supreme Court of Missouri adopted the "Standards for Operation of a Secure Juvenile Detention Facility" which then became effective on January 1, 2015 that guides detention policy and practices.

Section 7 presents admission, discharge, population, and length of stay information entered on the **Custom Room Facility Assignment (CZAROOM)** form of JIS for Missouri's secure detention facilities. Depending on the reporting objective, counts are based on admissions or discharges; a single youth may be counted multiple times if they were detained on more than one occasion.

Please note that as of August 2021, youth that are certified to stand trial as an adult shall be held in detention facilities. Those youth are separated out from the rest of the detention counts. They are represented in separate charts beginning with Figure 7-16 in this section.

Table 7-1 State Youth Population August 31, 2023

Metropolitan circuits [16, 21, & 22] account for roughly 55% of all youth detained in Missouri on the last day of August 2023.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Percent MO Youth Detained</b>
2	6	2.7%
5	7	3.2%
7	7	3.2%
11	9	4.1%
13	18	8.1%
16	24	10.8%
17	6	2.7%
19	1	0.5%
21	49	22.1%
22	49	22.1%
23	11	5.0%
24	7	3.2%
26	3	1.4%
29	7	3.2%
31	4	1.8%
33	4	1.8%
35	4	1.8%
44	6	2.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Figure 7-1 State Youth Admissions by Sex

There were 3,022 admissions to secure detention facilities in CY23. Males [2,407] accounted for 80% of these admissions. Females accounted for 20% [611].

Missing Data [4]




Figure 7-2 State Youth Admissions by Race

White youth accounted for 45% [1,353] of admissions to secure detention facilities while Black youth accounted for 49% [1,475]. Hispanic youth accounted for 3% [101] of admissions, while Asian/Pacific Islander youth [5] and Native American youth [12] accounted for less than 1% combined.

Missing Data [76]




Figure 7-3 State Youth Admissions by Sex and Race

Among male detainees, Black males accounted for the largest number of admissions to secure detention facilities [52%, 1,252], followed by White males [42%, 1,008]. Among female detainees, White females accounted for the largest percentage of admissions to a detention center [56%, 344], followed by Black females [36%, 223].

Missing data [76]




Figure 7-4 State Youth Admissions by Age Group

Youth between the ages of 15 and 16 years accounted for the majority of admissions [48%, 1,439], followed by ages 17 years or older [28%, 841]. The age groups of 13-14 [21%, 637] and 12 years or younger [3%, 101] accounted for the lowest percentage of admissions across age groups.

Missing Data [4]




Figure 7-5 State Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group

Male youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [38%, 1,134].

Missing Data [4]




Figure 7-6 State Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group

Black youth, 15 to 16 years old, represented the greatest number of admissions to detention facilities [23.9%, 703], followed by White youth of the same age group [21.3%, 627].

Missing Data [76]




Figure 7-7 State Youth Average Daily Population by Sex

The statewide average daily detention population was 230 youth. The vast majority [200, 87%] of these detainees were male.

Missing Data [4]




Figure 7-8 State Youth Average Daily Population by Race

The statewide average daily population for Black youth [150] in secure detention was greater than all other youth combined [83].

Missing Data [78]




Figure 7-9 State Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race

Within sex, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for Black males [134]. For the female population, Black detainees also had the highest average daily detention population [16].

Missing Data [78]






Figure 7-10 State Youth Average Daily Population by Age Group

Within age groups, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for 15-16 year old youth [115], followed by 17 years old or older youth [68]. The average daily population was the lowest for ages 12 and younger [5].

Missing Data [4]




Figure 7-11 State Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex

The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities was 30 days for males and 17 days for females.

Missing Data [4]




Figure 7-12 State Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race

Statewide, Black youth had the longest average length of stay of 35 days. Black and Hispanic youth had the longest median length of stay of 12 days.

Missing Data [74]




Figure 7-13 State Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide average length of stay was longest for Black and Asian/Pacific Islander males at 37 days. Black females at 24 days was the longest average length of stay amongst females in detention.

Missing Data [74]




Figure 7-14 State Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide median length of stay was longest for Hispanic males [14 days]. The second longest median length was for Black males [13 days].

Missing Data [74]




Figure 7-15 State Youth Median Length of Stay by Age Group

Youth 17 years old or older represented the longest average length of stay [29 days]. The average length of stay for the youth 12 years old and younger was the shortest [17 days].

Missing Data [4]




Figure 7-16 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex

There were 42 certified youth admissions to secure detention facilities in CY23. Males [40] accounted for 95% of these admissions. Females accounted for 2% [1].

Missing Data [1]




Figure 7-17 Certified Youth Admissions by Race

White youth accounted for 29% [12] of certified youth admissions to secure detention facilities while Black youth accounted for 69% [29].

Missing Data [1]




Figure 7-18 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Race

Among male detainees, Black males accounted for the largest number of admissions to secure detention facilities [73%, 29], followed by White males [28%, 11]. There was only one female certified youth detained.

Missing Data [1]




Figure 7-19 Certified Youth Admissions by Age Group

Youth 17 years or older [48%, 20] and 15-16 years or younger [43%, 18] accounted for the vast majority of all of certified youth admissions, followed by youth 13-14 years old [7%, 3].

Missing Data [1]




Figure 7-20 Certified Youth Admissions by Sex and Age Group

Male youth, 17 or older, represented the greatest number of certified youth admissions to detention facilities [48%, 20].

Missing Data [1]




Figure 7-21 Certified Youth Admissions by Race and Age Group

Black youth, 17 or older and 15-16 years old, both represented the greatest number of certified youth admissions to detention facilities [31%, 13].

Missing Data [1]




Figure 7-22 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex

The statewide average daily detention population was 17 youth. The vast majority [16.4, 96%] of these detainees were male.

Missing Data [1]




Figure 7-23 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Race

The statewide average daily population for Black youth [11] in secure detention was greater than White youth [6].

Missing Data [2]




Figure 7-24 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Sex and Race

Within sex, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for black males [11]. For the female population, white detainees had the highest average daily detention population [1].

Missing Data [2]




Figure 7-25 Certified Youth Average Daily Population by Age

Within age groups, the statewide average daily detention population was greatest for 15-16-year old youth [8], followed by 17 years old or older youth [7].






Figure 7-26 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Sex

The statewide average length of stay in detention facilities for certified youth was 149 days for males.




Figure 7-27 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Race

Statewide, black youth had the longest average length of stay of 143 days, and white youth had the longest median length of stay of 155 days.




Figure 7-28 Certified Youth Average Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide average length of stay was longest for black males at 143 days, followed by white males at 131 days.




Figure 7-29 Certified Youth Median Length of Stay by Sex and Race

The statewide median length of stay was longest for white males [155 days]. The second longest median length was for black males [91 days].





Figure 7-30 Certified Youth Average and Median Length of Stay by Age

Youth between the age of 15-16 years old or older represented the longest average length of stay [189 days] and longest median length of stay [131 days]



## Section 8: Division of Youth Services Commitments

Section 8 presents demographic information on youth committed to the Division of Youth Services (DYS) identified by a docket entry of DDYS – Committed to DYS on the **Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)** form of JIS in calendar 2023. For circuit level information on these commitments, refer to Appendix M. Assuming commitments to DYS are entered into JIS only once for a youth, the count is unduplicated. (**Note:** Docket entries in JIS produce data different from that historically reported by DYS.)

Figure 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex and Race

There were 501 youths committed to the custody of DYS in CY23. The majority [82%, 411] were male. White youth accounted for 57% [288] of juveniles committed to DYS, while black youth accounted for 37% [183]. The remaining 5% [25] were Hispanic.

Missing Data [5]





Figure 8-2 Statewide DYS Commitments by Age Group

Forty-nine percent [246] of youth committed to DYS were between the ages of 15 and 16. An additional 20% [100] were between 13-14 years of age. Youth younger than 12 years accounted for 1% [5], while 30% [150] of youth were aged 17 or older.

Missing Data [0]



## Tables 8-1 Statewide DYS Commitments by Sex, Race, and Age Group

White males age 16 [68] were the most common group committed to DYS. White males had more commitments than black males in every age group. Only black females age 13 [2] had more commitments than white females of the same age [2] committed in CY23.

Missing Data [5]

### Male youth

Age/Race	White	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian/ Pacific Islander
<=12	2	1	0	0	0
13	11	5	1	0	0
14	41	18	4	0	0
15	46	32	7	0	0
16	68	43	2	0	0
17	55	52	6	0	0
>=18	8	7	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

### Female Youth

Age/Race	White	Black	Hispanic	Native American	Asian/ Pacific Islander
<=12	1	0	0	0	0
13	1	2	0	0	0
14	11	6	0	0	0
15	16	9	0	0	0
16	11	5	3	0	0
17	15	3	2	0	0
>=18	2	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Section 9: Certification to Adult Court

Section 9 presents demographic information about youth certified to adult court, identified by the docket entry of DJVCA - JUV Certified to Adult Court on the ***Custom Docket Entry and Maintenance (CDADOCT)*** form of JIS in calendar 2023. For additional circuit level information about these certifications, refer to Appendix N. Assuming certifications are entered into JIS only once for a youth, the count presented is unduplicated.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.4 Certification mandates “the juvenile officer shall consider the implications of certification and consider certification only in circumstances in which issues of public safety cannot be mitigated by supervision and services in the juvenile justice system.”

Figure 9-1 Certifications by Sex

The statewide total for offenders certified to adult court was 97. Majority were males [95%, 92].

Missing Data [0]




Figure 9-2 Certifications by Race

The percentage of offenders certified to adult court was greater for black youth [67%, 65] than for white youth [33%, 32].

Missing Data [0]




Figure 9-3 Certifications by Age

The largest portions of offenders certified to adult courts were 18 years or older [45%, 44] and 17 years old [34%, 33]. Fifteen percent [15] were 16 years old and the remaining 5% [5] were 15-14 years old.

Missing Data [0]





Figure 9-4 Certifications Trends by Race

Since 2012, the number of black offenders certified to adult courts has increased 91% and the number of white offenders increased by 60%.

From 2022 to 2023, the total number of certifications increased by 24%. There were no offenders of the other races certified in 2023 compared to 4 in 2022.

This data may have been influenced by the raise the age legislation which went into effect July 2021. This legislation allowed juvenile offenders up to the age of 17 to be processed in juvenile courts.





## Section 10: Juvenile Offender Recidivism

Juvenile divisions across the country are being asked to provide evidence that public funds are used in cost-effective ways to reduce and prevent juvenile crime. For Missouri juvenile divisions to measure progress in this area, the following statewide definition of juvenile offender recidivism was developed through consensus:

*“A juvenile offender recidivist is any youth, referred to the juvenile office for a legally sufficient law violation during a calendar year, who receives one or more legally sufficient law violation(s) to the juvenile or adult court within one year of the initial referral’s disposition date.”*

Section 10 presents the demographic and offense characteristics that influenced recidivism rates for the calendar 2022 cohort of Missouri juvenile law offenders who were tracked through calendar 2023 for recidivism. Note that recidivism is tracked by the offender’s party id entered in JIS and is only tracked if the new offense occurs in the same circuit as the original offense.

Figure 10-1 Missouri Youth Offender Population

Approximately 0.7% [7,575] of the 1,013,143 juveniles aged 5-17 were referred to Missouri's juvenile and family division for legally sufficient law violation referrals in CY22.

**Offender Population as a Proportion of Missouri Youth**




Figure 10-2 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (All Law)

Approximately 21% [1,619] of the 7,575 juvenile law offenders in CY22 recidivated through a new law violation within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

**Percentage of Youth Recidivating**




Figure 10-3 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Misdemeanor A or Felony)

Roughly 15% [1,143] of the 7,575 juvenile law offenders in CY22 recidivated either with a new Class A misdemeanor or felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

**Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felonies or Misdemeanor A)**




Figure 10-4 Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony)

Eight percent [612] of the 7,575 juvenile law offenders in CY22 recidivated with a felony offense within one year of the disposition date of their initial referral.

**Percentage of Youth Recidivating (Felony Charges)**




Figure 10-5 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Year

The percentage of the recidivists with any law violation decreased by 0.4% between the 2021 cohort and the 2022 cohort. The percent of youth who recidivated with either a Class A misdemeanor or felony decreased 0.1% from CY21 cohort. The percentage of youth recidivating with a felony increased by 0.1% from CY21 cohort.




Figure 10-6 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Sex

Males [23.1%, 1,228] from the CY22 cohort recidivated at a higher rate than their female [17.3%, 389] counterparts. This holds true for those who recidivated with either Class A misdemeanor or felony offense, as well as for those who recidivated with only a felony offense.




Figure 10-7 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Race

Proportionately, black youth [28%, 654] from the CY22 cohort had a higher rate of recidivism than their other minority counterparts [20%, 49] and white counterparts [18%, 908] for all law referrals. The same holds true for referrals for felonies with class A misdemeanors, as well as all felony charges.




Figure 10-8 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Circuit Type

Recidivism from CY22 for all law violations was higher for youth in multi-county circuits [21.5%, 914] than for youth in single county circuits, [21.2%, 705]. However, the percentages were higher for Class A misdemeanors and felonies [16.9%, 564] in single county circuits than in multi-county circuits [13.6%, 579], and also higher for just felony referrals in single county circuits [9.6%, 320] than in multi-county circuits [6.9%, 292].





Figure 10-9 Percentage of Youth Recidivating by Age

The percentage of recidivism is highest for youth between the ages of 13 and 14 years for all types of offenses, except felony only charges. Proportionally, youth 15-16 years old had a higher recidivism rate for felonies [9%, 273].



## Section 11: Racial and Ethnic Disparity (RED)

RED is one of four core requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended in 2002. All states are required by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to make efforts to document and reduce RED. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act was reauthorized in 2018, also known as the Juvenile Justice Reform Act of 2018. One of its key components is to further determine if there are racial and ethnic disparities (RED) identified within in the juvenile justice system and actively work to address those issues by identifying and analyzing data on race and ethnicity at decision points in State, local or tribal juvenile justice systems to determine which such points create racial and ethnic disparities among youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system.

Disproportionate minority contact occurs whenever the overall volume of activity for minority youth at various juvenile justice contact points is disproportionately larger than the volume of activity for white youth at those points. It is important to examine *all* juvenile justice contact points due to the likelihood that minority youth will penetrate deeper into the juvenile justice system as a result of disproportionate minority contact with the system. Racial and ethnic disparities further involve the unfair or inequitable treatment of youth of color at those decision points in the juvenile justice system due to various reasons.

The existence of disproportionality does not necessarily mean that minority youth are experiencing disparity (or unequal treatment), because further analysis is needed to determine whether or not disproportionality is a consequence of disparities and/or other contributing mechanisms.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 1.15 Antidiscrimination and Disproportionate Minority Contact mandates “the juvenile officer shall prohibit discrimination and proactively address racial and ethnic disparities to ensure fundamental fairness and equal justice for those served by the juvenile office.”

## What is a Relative Rate Index (RRI)?

The data analysis of the OJJDP Relative Rate Index (RRI) compares the relative volume of activity (rate) for eight court contact points for each minority youth group with the volume of activity (rate) for the majority group (white youth). It provides a single index number that indicates the extent to which the volume of contact differs.

Because the Relative Rate Index is intended to capture the overall extent of youth involvement with the juvenile justice system, the RRI calculation is based on *cases*, not individual *youth*. If a youth is referred to the juvenile court multiple times during the course of a single year, all of those referrals are included. Therefore, the data provided include ***duplicated*** counts for all court contact points.

Example: The RRI comparing rates of referral to juvenile court:

Rate of Referral for black youth:

# of black youth referred:	$\frac{150}{500} = 0.30 \times 1000 = 300$
# of black youth in population	500

Rate of Referral for white youth:

# of white youth referred:	$\frac{200}{5000} = 0.04 \times 1000 = 40$
# of white youth in population	5000

Relative Rate Calculation for Referrals:

Rate of Referral for black youth:	$\frac{300}{40} = 7.5$ RRI
Rate of Referral for white youth	40

If the RRI is larger than 1.0, that means that the minority group experiences contact more often than white youth. If it is less than 1.0, that means that contact is less frequent. In this example, the RRI for black referrals is 7.5. This means that black youth are seven and a half times more likely to be referred to the juvenile office than white youth.



With the exception of the first rate (referral), which is calculated using the base of the number of youth in each major racial/ethnic grouping in the general population, each of the subsequent RRI is calculated based on the volume of activity for that racial/ethnic group in a proceeding stage in the case process. See Table 11-1.

Table 11-1 Identifying the Numerical Bases for Rate Calculations

<b>Decision Stage / Contact Point</b>	<b>Base for Rates</b>
Referrals to Juvenile Court	Rate per 1,000 Population
Referrals Diverted	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Involving Secure Detention	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Petitioned	Rate per 100 Referrals
Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings	Rate per 100 Petitions
Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities	Rate per 100 Delinquency Findings
Referrals Transferred to Adult Court	Rate per 100 Petitions Filed

Table 11-2 Relative Rate Index (RRI) Values

More than 1.00	Referrals to Juvenile Court Referrals Involving Secure Detention Referrals Petitioned Referrals Resulting in Delinquency Findings Referrals Resulting in Confinement in Secure Juvenile Correctional Facilities Referrals Transferred to Adult Court
Less than 1.00	Referrals Diverted Referrals Resulting in Supervision / Probation Placement

**Note:** RRI values that cause RED concern can be greater than 1.00 or less than 1.00.

#### **What Data are Used?**

- U.S. Census data for youth ages 10-17 in all counties in Missouri.
- Census data from the previous calendar year was used, because the Census population updates for the current year are not available at the time of publication.
- Office of State Courts Administrator delinquency data in the Judicial Information System (JIS). Law violation referrals and status referrals (but not child abuse and neglect referrals) were included.
- Transfers to other juvenile court referrals were not included

Table 11-3 Statewide Relative Rate Indices

Black youth experienced the largest disproportionality overall. Black youth were over-represented at referral, while Hispanic and Asian /Pacific Islander youth were under-represented at that contact point. Black youth also experienced negative disproportionality at: diversion, secure detention, petition, and cases transferred to adult court.

Contact Point	Black	Hispanic	Asian / Pacific Islander	Native American
Referral	<b>2.22</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>0.27</b>	*
Diversion	<b>0.89</b>	0.98	1.05	*
Secure Detention	<b>1.94</b>	<b>1.51</b>	**	*
Petition	<b>1.70</b>	1.10	0.60	*
Delinquent Findings	<b>0.90</b>	0.99	**	*
Supervision	1.03	0.84	**	*
Secure Confinement	<b>0.79</b>	1.55	**	*
Certification	<b>3.18</b>	**	**	*

Statistically significant results

**Bold Font**


Group is less than 1% of youth population \*

Insufficient number of cases for analysis \*\*

**Note:** Caution should be used when interpreting the Hispanic data, because race and ethnicity are not separated in JIS. Thus, Hispanic youth are under-counted.

Figure 11-1 Ten-Year Trend of Statewide RRI for Referrals of Black Youth

While the number of referrals has declined over the last decade, the RRI for referrals of black youth has remained relatively steady with the highest in 2023 at 2.4 and the lowest in 2018 and 2021 at 1.9. The reason for this is that, although referrals declined for all youth from 2014 to 2021, they did not do so evenly across groups in each year.



## Section 12: Juvenile Officer Workload

The Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload (JOWWL) system is an automated means of estimating the direct service need for additional deputy juvenile officers in Missouri's 35 multi-county circuits. The JOWWL compares the number of staff hours required to screen and process the status, law, and CA/N referrals received by juvenile divisions and to supervise youth in accordance with the **Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards**, against the actual number of staff hours available to complete these direct service activities. When workload demand exceeds the number of staff hours available to meet it, a need for additional direct service personnel is projected. The Circuit Court Budget Committee (CCBC) adopted and first used the results of the JOWWL for estimating FTE needs for juvenile officers in fiscal 2004. The CCBC has since used the JOWWL annually for this budgetary purpose. In January of 2020 a new workload study was conducted by the National Center for State Courts, and a new model was delivered the summer of 2020. The new model adjusted workload weights for various case processing activities and eliminated the Alternatives to Detention case processing category.

### Example of Workload Estimate for Mock Multi-County Circuit

**Annual Case-Specific Workload:** Annual total work minutes required to service juvenile cases at established standards includes screening, processing and supervising delinquency and CA/N cases, based on workload values identified by the 2020 juvenile officer workload study [Table 12-1].

*Example: Mock Circuit, 255,314 minutes of direct service work are required to accommodate case management demand.*

**Staffing Demand:** Total number of direct service staff needed to meet Annual Case-Specific Workload. (Annual available work minutes per Juvenile Office is 75,761)

*Example: Mock Circuit, Total Annual Case-Specific Workload / 75,761 mnts. = Staffing Demand (255,314 / 75,761 mnts. = 3.4 direct service staff needed).*

**Circuit FTE:** Total number of direct service staff currently employed by circuit.

*Example: Mock Circuit employs 2 direct service staff. Currently this includes all state-paid DJO I, II & III positions and all full-time staff paid through DYS diversion grant funds.*

**FTE Need:** Additional direct service staff needed to service Total Workload Hours per standards.

*Example: Mock Circuit, Staffing Demand – Circuit FTE = FTE Need (3.4 - 2.0 = 1.4 additional direct service staff).*

Table 12-1 Workload Values per Year from Juvenile Officer Workload Study (2020)

Diversion

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Diversion	639.24

Status Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1243.58
Informal Processing	4521.62
Informal Supervision	1021.78
Formal Processing	5040.46
Formal Supervision: All risk levels	2084.64
Truancy Court	1849.89

Law Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1522.67
Informal Processing	4838.43
Informal Supervision	783.48
Formal Processing	16761.28
Formal Supervision: All risk levels	3296.88
Juvenile Treatment Court	2116.20

Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N) Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening (Informal/formal)	1383
Informal Processing	8942.14
Informal Supervision	1125.96
Formal Processing	13055.17
Formal Supervision and out-of-home placement	367.30
Protections Orders	261.60
Family Treatment Court	873.07

Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) Cases

Column Description	Workload Value (Minutes)
Screening	1333.13
Court Related Activity	1333.13

Table 12-2 Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload

January 2023 Monthly Workload JIS Counts																															
	Diversion	Screening (Informal/Formal)	Informal processing	Informal supervision	Formal processing	Formal supervision	Formal supervision: All risk levels	Truancy court or other specialty court	Screening (Informal/Formal)	Informal processing	Informal supervision	Formal processing	Formal supervision	Formal supervision: All risk levels	Juvenile Treatment Court	Screening (Informal/Formal)	Informal processing	Informal supervision	Formal processing	Formal supervision	Formal sup and out-of-home placement	Protection orders	Family treatment court	Screening	Court related activity	75/61 Mnts- JO Annual Availability	6,313 Mnts- JO Availability Monthly				
Monthly WL Minutes	53.27	103.63	376.80	85.15	420.04	173.72	154.16	126.89	403.20	65.29	1396.77	274.74	176.35	115.25	745.18	93.83	1087.93	30.61	21.80	72.76	111.09	111.09									
Annual WL Mnts	639.24	1243.58	4521.62	1021.78	5040.46	2084.64	1849.89	1522.67	4838.43	783.48	16761.28	3296.88	2116.20	1383.00	8942.14	1125.96	13055.17	367.30	261.60	873.07	1333.13	1333.13									
Circuit	All Types	Status Cases						Law Cases						CA/N Cases						TPR Cases		Annual Case-Specific Workload	Circuit FTE	Staffing Demand	Additional or Subtracted FTE Need	Postive Staffing Need Only	Circuit				
1		12.5	3.9	17.3	1.0	21.7		2.8	0.7	3.0	0.9	7.8		6.4	0.3	0.0	1.8	83.2	2.5		0.4	0.5		219,594	3	2.90	-0.10	0.00	1		
2	11.8	11.0	5.7	24.6	0.0	0.0		8.3	2.8	16.1	1.5	12.3	1.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	6.7	173.8	6.3	17.0	0.8	2.2		361,126	4	4.77	0.77	0.77	2		
3		12.0	2.8	15.8	0.4	3.3		8.1	2.6	16.2	2.3	21.4		11.7	2.3	16.8	2.0	45.0	3.1		0.6	2.5		302,824	4	4.00	0.00	0.00	3		
4		25.7	8.4	37.4	0.8	1.4		10.0	4.3	15.4	1.0	4.8		17.8	1.8	8.2	6.8	96.0	2.7		0.1	0.7		370,984	4	4.90	0.90	0.90	4		
5	0.0	39.3	21.9	6.2	3.2	10.8	0.0	20.8	7.3	3.3	4.7	47.3		10.9	0.0	0.0	5.8	100.8	22.8		0.4	0.6		631,712	8.5	8.35	-0.15	0.00	5		
8		3.0	1.2	5.7	0.3	0.0		2.3	0.6	3.3	0.8	7.6		0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	8.6	5.2		0.1	0.0		68,307	1.5	0.90	-0.60	0.00	8		
9	26.8	7.3	1.3	6.1	0.8	1.9		2.9	0.2	0.6	0.7	0.0	0.1	5.0	0.1	0.0	3.6	41.7	5.1		0.3	1.0		136,111	3	1.80	-1.20	0.00	9		
10		13.3	4.8	50.9	0.3	2.0	0.0	15.5	5.5	70.3	2.8	2.3		2.8	0.3	0.2	2.6	55.4	18.6		3.2	8.3		337,322	6	4.46	-1.54	0.00	10		
12		30.8	8.0	45.4	1.2	1.8		19.2	3.3	26.1	2.3	20.8		13.7	2.3	6.8	4.1	151.4	8.3	8.7	3.1	16.2		493,626	7	6.52	-0.48	0.00	12		
13		60.9	16.3	40.6	9.8	14.3		65.8	21.0	32.5	17.9	95.5		24.6	2.5	1.0	21.5	488.2	32.4	10.1	2.1	10.5		1,664,030	18.5	21.99	3.49	3.49	13		
14	7.9	25.3	7.0	25.8	3.5	3.0		8.0	3.3	17.3	1.1	3.0		13.0	0.3	0.0	5.7	196.0	3.3		0.1	0.6		357,060	4.5	4.72	0.22	0.22	14		
15	15.8	22.0	6.7	23.7	0.7	2.3		27.0	8.7	22.7	1.3	5.3		2.7	0.1	0.0	1.8	64.8	12.5		0.0	0.7		295,413	3.5	3.90	0.40	0.40	15		
17	46.8	37.6	17.3	40.4	2.7	7.2	0.0	50.5	24.6	52.4	11.1	54.0		15.8	0.7	0.0	12.6	257.6	21.1		1.3	7.2		1,128,407	13.5	14.91	1.41	1.41	17		
18	1.3	16.3	5.0	24.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	25.8	8.8	49.3	2.9	3.6	0.0	6.4	2.3	11.8	1.3	80.0	8.5	0.0	1.3	6.6		357,639	4	4.73	0.73	0.73	18		
20	17.5	14.1	3.6	15.8	0.2	2.8		31.2	9.7	42.8	2.0	15.8		9.8	0.0	0.0	9.8	369.8	20.4	15.5	2.8	18.8		605,130	8	8.00	0.00	0.00	20		
24		12.4	2.4	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.0	28.8	7.1	3.5	5.6	21.1		11.8	0.1	0.0	11.7	397.1	15.8	20.1	5.3	33.9		662,717	8.5	8.76	0.26	0.26	24		
25		71.9	43.8	26.7	1.6	10.8		31.1	16.8	19.3	4.3	12.0		97.6	22.7	5.7	24.9	563.8	20.3		1.4	9.8		1,496,558	14	19.78	5.78	5.78	25		
26		26.7	3.3	7.5	0.4	1.0		23.7	3.3	18.5	4.6	10.7		11.2	0.1	1.7	3.3	258.0	32.2		3.1	18.4		431,750	6.5	5.71	-0.79	0.00	26		
27	10.7	15.7	11.6	38.3	1.3	5.1		11.3	7.1	33.7	1.7	8.7		26.8	14.6	6.4	10.5	176.5	8.8		1.2	2.1		652,967	6	8.63	2.63	2.63	27		
28		27.7	15.5	11.8	1.3	0.3		24.6	10.7	18.9	1.5	4.8		14.9	0.7	0.0	5.7	137.1	9.2		1.5	4.9		430,536	5.5	5.69	0.19	0.19	28		
30	12.6	14.3	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0		31.8	5.5	21.2	3.9	18.3		27.8	0.2	0.5	8.3	215.7	9.6		2.9	15.3		500,176	6.5	6.61	0.11	0.11	30		
32		55.9	12.9	73.9	0.1	0.8	65.8	29.3	13.6	72.2	3.6	13.2	0.0	27.3	13.3	55.5	7.4	250.8	9.1	11.1	1.6	4.3		1,025,323	13	13.55	0.55	0.55	32		
33	143.5	11.8	1.6	6.8	0.9	2.8	0.8	24.3	7.2	23.0	2.9	8.5	5.1	4.5	0.2	0.3	4.3	164.3	6.8	10.1	0.0	0.0		445,641	9	5.89	-3.11	0.00	33		
34		32.0	20.7	39.1	0.2	2.0		13.6	5.8	13.8	3.5	31.4		16.7	0.2	0.0	10.2	191.4	5.3		0.3	0.8		630,096	6.5	8.33	1.83	1.83	34		
35		19.3	7.8	19.6	0.8	1.1		21.6	6.9	16.6	5.8	18.1		29.4	3.8	9.7	14.4	283.8	8.7	27.6	0.3	1.3		728,010	9.5	9.62	0.12	0.12	35		
36		7.4	0.5	1.3	0.3	0.0		25.1	6.4	9.7	4.4	14.8		20.2	3.8	12.4	14.7	293.5	8.8		0.8	5.8		600,467	6.5	7.94	1.44	1.44	36		
37	129.6	21.1	12.5	14.8	0.3	0.0		17.0	8.7	17.2	3.2	15.5	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.6	5.2	169.8	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.0		513,403	6	6.78	0.78	0.78	37		
38	19.9	42.3	7.4	63.9	3.3	3.3		23.1	4.5	65.4	4.4	14.3		11.4	0.3	2.1	3.2	144.3	10.0		0.7	6.6		544,546	6	7.20	1.20	1.20	38		
39		11.9	1.1	10.7	0.4	2.0		19.5	1.8	17.6	2.3	1.3		17.3	0.3	0.0	9.7	237.6	10.6		3.0	7.8		387,538	7	5.12	-1.88	0.00	39		
40	78.3	21.9	4.6	26.8	1.3	0.0		30.4	4.5	36.7	5.5	13.4	1.4	20.4	0.0	0.0	14.3	182.5	17.1	1.7	3.2	5.9		667,735	9	8.82	-0.18	0.00	40		
41		12.3	4.3	18.3	0.4	0.0		5.2	2.2	13.4	0.9	6.1		2.7	0.0	0.2	2.0	109.3	1.9		0.5	2.7		194,810	4	2.57	-1.43	0.00	41		
42		10.9	5.8	47.3	1.8	0.2		7.6	4.3	20.9	0.5	0.0		12.8	0.0	0.3	12.1	221.4	9.8		1.5	12.2		432,265	5	5.71	0.71	0.71	42		
43		12.2	1.4	8.6	0.9	5.0		16.5	3.9	25.8	2.3	13.1		22.2	1.0	1.8	7.3	179.2	5.8		0.8	3.9		401,617	4.5	5.31	0.81	0.81	43		
44	32.1	1.6	0.9	3.5	0.3	0.0		7.4	3.7	17.1	1.5	9.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	2.8	141.3	4.5		3.3	8.3		238,487	3.5	3.15	-0.35	0.00	44		
45		22.0	4.1	11.4	0.8	4.3		19.8	7.7	21.3	2.5	11.0	0.0	17.8	0.3	0.0	7.4	141.9	14.3	9.3	1.5	7.6		433,162	5	5.72	0.72	0.72	45		
46		8.5	3.1	8.8	0.7	0.2		14.3	4.5	11.6	2.1	8.7		15.3	2.3	4.2	12.4	291.8	4.8		3.8	29.5		514,058	5	6.79	1.79	1.79	46		
Total	555	791	279	819	43	111	68	724	239	869	120	555	8	568	76	146	278	6,963	402	131	53	257		19,261,150	239.50	254.54	15.04	25.05	Totals		
	36.97	21.96	7.76	22.76	1.21	3.09	9.66	20.10	6.64	24.13	3.33	15.42	0.84	15.78	2.13	4.05	7.72	193.42	11.15	10.93	1.47	7.14									

## Section 13: CA/N Time Standards

In March 2005, the Supreme Court of Missouri issued an order adopting Court Operating Rule (COR) 23.01, Reporting Requirements for Child Abuse and Neglect Cases, effective July 1, 2005. This COR requires the presiding judge in each circuit to submit a quarterly report (CA/N Quarterly) to OSCA. The CA/N Quarterly Report lists all child abuse and neglect hearings where standards were not met during the quarter. These standards are based on the requirements of Supreme Court Rule 124.01, Rules of Practice and Procedure in Juvenile Divisions and Family Court Divisions of the Circuit, which states that the following hearings shall be held:

- 1) Within three days, excluding Saturday, Sunday and legal holidays, a protective custody hearing
- 2) Within 60 days, an adjudication hearing
- 3) Within 90 days, a dispositional hearing
- 4) Every 90 to 120 days after the dispositional hearing during the first 12 months in which the juvenile is in the custody of the children's division, a dispositional review hearing
- 5) Within 12 months and at least annually thereafter, a permanency hearing
- 6) As often as necessary after each permanency hearing, but at least every six months, during the period in which the juvenile remains in the custody of the children's division, a permanency review hearing.

The data from each circuit is compiled into a final report and submitted to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Missouri and the Commission on Retirement, Removal and Discipline

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 5.7 Timeliness of Proceedings and Applicable Time Standards mandates "the juvenile officer shall ensure the timely scheduling of all hearings and not be a party to undue and unnecessary delays. Further, the juvenile officer shall comply with established time standards in the scheduling of hearings to the extent such is in control of the juvenile officer and serves the interest of justice."

Table 13-1 CA/N Hearings Held Timely

In FY23, the juvenile and family divisions conducted the required CA/N hearings in a timely fashion. Thirty-five divisions held 95% or more of their hearings on time; while at the statewide level, 94% of hearings were held timely.

Table is continued on the next page.

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Hearings Held</b>	<b>Hearings Held Timely</b>	<b>Percent Held Timely</b>
1	318	318	100%
2	734	728	99%
3	224	221	99%
4	404	399	99%
5	473	470	99%
6	145	137	94%
7	631	572	91%
8	57	55	96%
9	397	377	95%
10	690	643	93%
11	960	928	97%
12	775	775	100%
13	1,700	1,631	96%
14	562	455	81%
15	321	321	100%
16	4,088	2,886	71%
17	612	597	98%
18	427	427	100%
19	439	425	97%
20	1,375	1,333	97%
21	4,123	3,770	91%
22	2,526	2,481	98%
23	2,397	2,267	95%

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>Hearings Held</b>	<b>Hearings Held Timely</b>	<b>Percent Held Timely</b>
24	2,231	2,151	96%
25	2,269	2,251	99%
26	1,245	1,244	100%
27	523	505	97%
28	491	488	99%
29	1,469	1,466	100%
30	947	920	97%
31	2,902	2,890	100%
32	1,083	991	92%
33	734	732	100%
34	668	648	97%
35	1,271	1,251	98%
36	1,068	878	82%
37	509	498	98%
38	609	609	100%
39	1,269	1,268	100%
40	1,073	939	88%
41	336	336	100%
42	1,220	1,145	94%
43	631	587	93%
44	591	576	97%
45	572	556	97%
46	1,029	1,029	100%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>49,118</b>	<b>46,174</b>	<b>94%</b>



## Section 14: Juvenile and Family Division Programs and Diversion

Juvenile Officers across the state of Missouri provide a variety of programming to youth and their families on a daily basis to address their particular risk and needs. These programs are intended to decrease recidivism, promote accountability, enhance community safety, enhance child and family safety, and teach prosocial behaviors. The programs detailed below are programs that have been documented in the Justice Information System.

The Missouri Juvenile Officer Performance Standards (2017) section 2.4 Diversion mandates “the juvenile officer shall utilize evidence-based diversion programming whenever appropriate.” Section 3.13 Specialized Services and Treatment mandates “the juvenile officer shall provide specialized services and treatment specific to the offense, gender, and culture of the juvenile to the extent practicable based on available resources.”

These programs are categorized into several main areas listed below:

- **Accountability Programs:** These programs primarily try to teach youth how to take responsibility for their actions and empower them to develop more prosocial behaviors at home, school, and in the community.
- **Alternative Court Programs:** These are specialty court dockets or programs that are meant to address a specific problem area for youth and provide accountability, education, and resources for a specific issue.
- **Anger Management/Conflict Resolution Programs:** These programs are meant to teach youth how to effectively identify their anger and manage it appropriately in a variety of social settings.
- **Diversionary Programs:** Diversionary Programs are programs that are meant to divert youth from various entry points into the juvenile justice system. Diversion programs are divided into four levels based on the time that the offense is committed by the juvenile and when the juvenile participates in the program.
  - Level one diversion programs are used to completely prevent unnecessary referrals from coming to the juvenile office.
  - Level two diversion programs are used when the actions of a juvenile could result in a referral to the juvenile officer.

- Level three diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile court from formal court action into appropriate community based programs.
- Level four diversion programs divert youth referred to the juvenile office from secure confinement or commitment to the Missouri Division of Youth Services so that they can remain in the community.
- **Gender Specific Programs:** These programs provide prosocial interventions and education specific to the needs of boys or girls that are involved with the juvenile justice system.
- **Health and Fitness Programs:** These programs are meant to promote the overall health and well-being of youth referred to the juvenile justice system.
- **Mental Health Programs:** These programs provide a variety of mental health services to a youth or their family that address both the internal and external issues that may be contributing to problematic behaviors by youth.
- **Monitoring Programs:** These programs primarily monitor the whereabouts and activities of youth to promote community safety according to a youth's risk level.
- **Parenting Education and Support Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education, resources, and support to parents or guardians whose children are involved in either the juvenile justice system or child welfare system.
- **Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending Programs:** These programs are meant to provide education and support to youth referred to the court for problem sexual behaviors or sex offenses to try to prevent re-offense and promote more prosocial thought patterns.
- **Prosocial Juvenile Programs:** These programs created by juvenile officers are innovative and may fit into several categories.
- **School and Academic Related Programs:** These are programs that are meant to promote success for youth in school and the educational setting.
- **Sexual Education Programs:** These programs are meant to provide overall education and support to youth involved with the court to improve their health and who are at risk for pregnancy, sexual violence or receiving a sexually transmitted infection.
- **Substance Abuse Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education, treatment, and support to youth who have been referred for substance related offenses or identify as having a substance abuse problem.

- **Victim Education and Restorative Justice Programs:** These are programs that are meant to provide education to youth regarding the impact of their offense on the victim and promote empathy for the victim. These programs further provide services that are meant to restore for the victim what has been done wrong by the juvenile.
- **Vocational and Life Skills Development Programs:** These are programs that meant to teach youth skills that can help them demonstrate socially appropriate behaviors and gain and retain employment in the community.

Table 14-1 Juvenile Program Categories and the number of Participants

In CY23, there were 11,079 juveniles that participated in court sponsored programs. Monitoring was the most frequently used program category with participants [2,594, 23%]. Victim Education and Restorative Justice [2,127, 19%], Vocational or Life Skills [1,442 13%], and Mental Health [1,349, 12%], were the other most common program categories.

Missing Data [0]

Juvenile Program Categories	Number of Participants	Percent of Total
Accountability	762	6.9%
Alternative Court	394	3.6%
Anger Management / Conflict Resolution	201	1.8%
Gender Specific	183	1.7%
Health and Fitness	60	0.5%
Mental Health	1,349	12.2%
Monitoring	2,594	23.4%
Parenting Education and Support	359	3.2%
Problem Sexual Behavior and Offending	41	0.4%
Prosocial Activities	262	2.4%
School or Academic Support	348	3.1%
Sex Education	36	0.3%
Substance Abuse	921	8.3%
Victim Education and Restorative Justice	2,127	19.2%
Vocational and Life Skills Development	1,442	13.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>11,079</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 14-2 Juvenile Diversion Programs and the number of participants

In CY23, Juvenile Diversion Programs served 6,094 youth. A youth could have participated in more than one diversion program.

Level 1 Diversion programs were the most commonly used with 4,949 participants [81%] followed by Level 2 diversion programs with 1,045 participants [17%].

**Note:** Diversion level 1 and 2 counts are only reported in multi-county circuits. They report their counts for credit in the Juvenile Officer Weighted Workload model. Diversion 3 & 4 counts are captured through specific program codes entered in the JIS system. Those codes could be entered statewide.

Circuits might be participating in a diversion program but not reporting those counts to the Office of State Courts Administrator. Those counts will not be reflected in the following table.

Missing Data [0]

Juvenile Diversion Programs CY23	Number of Participants	Percent of Total
Level 1	4,949	81.2%
Level 2	1,045	17.1%
Level 3 and 4	100	1.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,094</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

# Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>273</b>
Clark	0	10	4	1	1	6	0	3	23	55	4	26	41	174
Schuyler	0	9	5	0	0	0	0	1	13	7	0	9	13	57
Scotland	0	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	4	6	42
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>319</b>
Adair	0	61	14	0	1	5	0	13	33	13	6	30	15	191
Knox	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	8	0	1	1	30
Lewis	0	12	4	0	0	3	0	4	25	25	2	10	13	98
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>389</b>
Grundy	1	10	23	0	1	0	0	6	49	46	5	49	25	215
Harrison	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	1	23	11	3	29	11	90
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	7	2	21
Putnam	0	9	2	0	0	0	0	7	15	10	0	14	6	63
<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>712</b>
Atchison	0	15	4	0	0	0	0	18	23	0	1	1	17	79
Gentry	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	18	30	2	2	6	15	80
Holt	0	14	6	0	0	0	0	13	17	0	0	0	14	64
Nodaway	1	56	21	0	0	0	0	191	80	4	4	25	96	478
Worth	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	2	11
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1,221</b>
Andrew	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	19	33	5	1	3	4	76
Buchanan	0	131	31	0	1	3	4	172	474	100	3	197	29	1,145
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>415</b>
Platte	0	43	13	0	1	0	1	52	151	50	25	1	78	415
<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>763</b>
Clay	9	103	19	0	5	13	0	139	148	21	45	7	254	763
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>159</b>
Carroll	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	7	9	0	0	0	32
Ray	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	56	11	43	0	0	0	127
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>197</b>
Chariton	0	13	4	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	2	3	10	41
Linn	0	20	10	0	1	0	0	6	8	18	3	7	28	101
Sullivan	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	7	4	22	0	4	7	55
<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>393</b>
Marion	0	3	16	37	0	0	0	115	96	0	2	11	43	323
Monroe	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	11
Ralls	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	21	13	0	0	3	13	59
<b>11</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>1,310</b>
St. Charles	57	115	37	0	5	11	8	119	347	78	183	14	336	1,310
<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>837</b>
Audrain	0	15	27	0	1	0	1	28	74	136	12	18	11	323
Montgomery	0	15	13	0	0	0	0	41	47	40	4	25	3	188
Warren	1	39	2	0	0	0	0	61	31	100	12	36	44	326

# Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>2,006</b>
Boone	0	193	343	1	1	2	0	258	56	410	100	25	28	1,417
Callaway	0	63	69	0	0	5	0	41	39	320	22	21	9	589
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>662</b>
Howard	0	39	8	0	0	2	0	5	17	51	10	34	6	172
Randolph	0	113	13	0	0	7	0	44	78	129	26	69	11	490
<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>655</b>
Lafayette	0	15	17	0	1	4	0	36	47	121	5	26	70	342
Saline	0	14	5	0	0	0	0	45	62	140	4	3	40	313
<b>16</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>1,910</b>
Jackson	324	480	211	4	22	117	4	6	16	8	34	58	626	1,910
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>1,613</b>
Cass	0	126	113	0	0	0	0	232	158	487	35	0	33	1,184
Johnson	0	57	44	0	1	0	0	120	93	78	12	0	24	429
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>643</b>
Cooper	0	8	26	0	0	0	0	40	68	119	1	12	36	310
Pettis	0	9	24	1	0	1	1	84	100	42	7	20	44	333
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>534</b>
Cole	0	44	7	1	0	117	0	16	37	202	37	38	35	534
<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>731</b>
Franklin	0	105	16	0	0	6	0	110	83	174	48	19	69	630
Gasconade	0	20	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	16	4	1	8	63
Osage	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	3	0	9	38
<b>21</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>1,132</b>	<b>719</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1,948</b>	<b>5,530</b>
St. Louis Co.	185	307	137	154	208	27	28	362	288	1,132	719	35	1,948	5,530
<b>22</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>1,718</b>
St. Louis City	69	432	134	3	6	91	29	10	72	130	133	4	605	1,718
<b>23</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>2,239</b>
Jefferson	36	247	137	0	0	103	0	109	184	790	65	420	148	2,239
<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>766</b>
Madison	5	30	6	0	0	1	0	19	1	8	5	2	9	86
St. Francois	1	91	29	0	1	4	1	140	17	148	11	8	34	485
St. Genevieve	0	2	5	0	0	8	0	14	10	30	6	1	3	79
Washington	2	27	14	0	5	7	0	18	9	30	0	0	4	116
<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>755</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>2,539</b>
Maries	0	9	0	0	0	5	0	6	1	0	0	13	18	52
Phelps	0	111	31	0	1	5	2	132	37	41	0	211	239	810
Pulaski	0	142	15	0	0	20	2	485	72	1	2	226	52	1,017
Texas	0	35	1	0	0	0	0	266	15	0	35	305	3	660

# Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>1,178</b>
Camden	0	14	11	0	0	0	0	35	22	133	10	56	25	306
Laclede	0	32	8	0	0	0	0	74	118	101	11	45	66	455
Miller	0	14	10	8	0	1	0	16	17	97	14	29	31	237
Moniteau	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	8	9	32	4	0	3	61
Morgan	0	12	1	4	0	1	1	14	7	55	1	1	22	119
<b>27</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>708</b>
Bates	0	20	9	1	0	18	0	19	54	84	4	17	9	235
Benton	10	33	8	1	0	0	0	12	15	7	1	4	4	95
Henry	0	24	5	1	0	0	0	103	42	33	12	16	7	243
St. Clair	0	8	7	1	0	5	1	10	50	26	7	11	9	135
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>903</b>
Barton	0	14	10	1	0	0	0	94	23	13	0	2	8	165
Cedar	0	33	1	1	0	0	0	136	8	13	0	3	11	206
Dade	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	47	3	1	5	4	0	67
Vernon	0	28	13	2	0	2	1	106	36	168	17	49	43	465
<b>29</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>308</b>
Jasper	14	161	48	3	1	6	0	23	8	27	1	5	11	308
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>937</b>
Dallas	0	21	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	24	1	28	19	110
Hickory	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	4	5	10	6	11	13	56
Polk	0	33	17	4	0	0	1	7	33	101	67	90	61	414
Webster	0	45	21	0	0	0	2	1	7	97	10	141	33	357
<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>806</b>
Greene	3	364	56	6	3	46	1	33	77	83	60	21	53	806
<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>1,455</b>
Bollinger	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	59	70	1	7	6	156
Cape Girardeau	2	45	57	0	1	2	0	129	285	329	22	84	49	1,005
Perry	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	0	174	64	14	14	15	294
<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>493</b>
Mississippi	4	26	3	0	0	0	2	6	22	2	1	5	25	96
Scott	0	46	15	0	0	0	0	85	84	39	20	23	85	397
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>803</b>
New Madrid	0	63	9	0	0	0	0	72	55	3	4	32	42	280
Pemiscot	0	84	15	0	0	0	0	166	105	3	0	71	79	523
<b>35</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>848</b>
Dunklin	3	38	21	1	1	25	0	0	0	149	2	0	3	243
Stoddard	2	104	8	0	0	43	2	121	208	1	31	84	1	605
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>644</b>
Butler	0	116	53	2	0	5	0	68	39	188	3	13	57	544
Carter	0	13	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	0	2	3	37
Ripley	0	29	5	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	2	4	3	63

# Appendix A: Total Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal With Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>620</b>
Howell	2	36	32	0	2	9	0	194	50	58	7	55	49	494
Oregon	0	10	2	1	0	0	0	10	8	9	1	30	14	85
Shannon	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	10	3	5	0	2	7	41
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>1,065</b>
Christian	0	122	50	2	1	4	0	249	165	92	37	212	131	1,065
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>890</b>
Barry	0	47	15	0	0	0	0	139	32	88	5	5	17	348
Lawrence	0	40	4	1	1	0	0	103	11	72	18	14	22	286
Stone	0	32	9	0	0	0	0	98	6	78	13	12	8	256
<b>40</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>932</b>
McDonald	0	45	38	0	0	12	0	120	76	18	0	29	25	363
Newton	1	93	15	0	2	47	0	6	60	82	24	151	88	569
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>262</b>
Macon	0	15	2	0	0	0	0	84	33	20	3	3	23	183
Shelby	0	12	10	0	0	0	0	9	39	2	2	1	4	79
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>343</b>
Crawford	0	53	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	8	8	7	17	105
Dent	0	35	1	0	0	0	0	0	54	5	0	0	1	96
Iron	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	28	0	76
Reynolds	0	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	33
Wayne	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	3	1	33
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>662</b>
Caldwell	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	1	23	5	65
Clinton	0	22	10	0	0	0	0	6	10	24	3	14	13	102
Daviess	0	26	2	0	0	0	0	11	4	22	2	9	7	83
DeKalb	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	6	29
Livingston	0	29	19	0	0	0	0	3	65	62	16	16	173	383
<b>44</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>131</b>
Douglas	1	7	4	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	3	0	24
Ozark	1	7	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	1	0	19
Wright	2	22	6	0	0	1	0	7	27	4	0	17	2	88
<b>45</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>825</b>
Lincoln	1	66	14	1	0	8	4	56	95	165	29	5	291	735
Pike	0	16	0	0	0	2	0	11	0	33	2	4	22	90
<b>46</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>527</b>
Taney	21	138	14	2	0	9	0	65	65	105	27	18	63	527
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>758</b>	<b>5,883</b>	<b>2,397</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>6,333</b>	<b>5,812</b>	<b>8,397</b>	<b>2,176</b>	<b>3,629</b>	<b>7,033</b>	<b>43,874</b>



## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>33</b>
Clark	0	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	4	4	2	0	6	23
Schuyler	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	6
Scotland	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>112</b>
Adair	0	1	14	0	1	0	0	8	16	6	2	2	9	59
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	9
Lewis	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	4	14	8	2	2	8	44
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>92</b>
Grundy	0	3	16	0	1	0	0	3	15	5	4	1	8	56
Harrison	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	3	5	5	29
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Putnam	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	6
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>127</b>
Atchison	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	6
Gentry	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	1	9	19
Holt														0
Nodaway	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	15	33	0	4	5	26	97
Worth	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	5
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>300</b>
Andrew	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	12	5	4	1	0	4	31
Buchanan	0	38	10	0	1	2	4	86	30	36	1	50	11	269
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>313</b>
Platte	0	8	8	0	1	0	1	45	126	32	24	1	67	313
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>376</b>
Clay	0	17	14	0	1	5	0	136	132	19	45	6	1	376
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>
Carroll	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	3	0	0	0	13
Ray	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	28	7	8	0	0	0	52
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>36</b>
Chariton														0
Linn	0	2	4	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	3	2	15	31
Sullivan	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	5
<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>204</b>
Marion	0	0	15	13	0	0	0	37	51	0	2	10	30	158
Monroe	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Ralls	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	17	8	0	0	3	7	41
<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>899</b>
St. Charles	16	27	35	0	1	4	8	96	287	15	148	9	253	899
<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>263</b>
Audrain	0	3	18	0	1	0	0	7	15	38	11	8	6	107
Montgomery	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	10	11	7	4	3	2	47
Warren	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	27	6	29	10	12	19	109

## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>813</b>
Boone	0	5	213	1	0	1	0	138	26	126	57	15	17	599
Callaway	0	0	35	0	0	4	0	9	20	111	11	15	9	214
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>106</b>
Howard	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	9	6	2	0	31
Randolph	0	9	4	0	0	1	0	9	19	18	8	4	3	75
<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>321</b>
Lafayette	0	2	9	0	0	2	0	20	20	55	3	15	49	175
Saline	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	22	42	46	2	1	24	146
<b>16</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>853</b>
Jackson	109	87	150	3	4	57	3	6	16	7	12	49	350	853
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>694</b>
Cass	0	26	84	0	0	0	0	151	84	160	16	0	6	527
Johnson	0	1	29	0	1	0	0	47	47	27	6	0	9	167
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>335</b>
Cooper	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	20	41	58	0	10	26	176
Pettis	0	3	12	0	0	0	1	33	47	22	5	4	32	159
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>289</b>
Cole	0	6	0	0	0	82	0	4	18	113	21	23	22	289
<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>426</b>
Franklin	0	7	16	0	0	4	0	71	65	103	44	11	47	368
Gasconade	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	6	4	1	6	33
Osage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	3	0	9	25
<b>21</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>698</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1,113</b>	<b>3,270</b>
St. Louis Co.	88	37	91	74	79	12	27	303	221	698	513	14	1,113	3,270
<b>22</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>940</b>
St. Louis City	34	45	111	3	2	30	28	2	41	39	121	3	481	940
<b>23</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>963</b>
Jefferson	15	34	78	0	0	37	0	90	125	473	47	3	61	963
<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>392</b>
Madison	2	2	6	0	0	1	0	4	1	6	2	1	6	31
St. Francois	1	23	26	0	0	3	1	109	10	88	9	5	27	302
Ste. Genevieve	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	10	10	12	5	1	3	47
Washington	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	12
<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>405</b>
Maries	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	7
Phelps	0	7	20	0	0	1	1	36	14	0	0	29	35	143
Pulaski	0	9	11	0	0	4	2	110	28	0	2	41	10	217
Texas	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	16	6	0	7	7	0	38

## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>414</b>
Camden	0	2	11	0	0	0	0	20	14	25	8	3	14	97
Laclede	0	12	8	0	0	0	0	12	64	7	5	5	18	131
Miller	0	6	8	5	0	1	0	11	13	36	10	5	17	112
Moniteau	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	5	2	12	1	0	3	27
Morgan	0	7	1	3	0	1	1	7	3	11	1	1	11	47
<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>139</b>
Bates	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	24	11	2	0	4	46
Benton	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	5	6	0	0	2	1	20
Henry	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	1	1	2	3	26
St. Clair	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	23	9	5	2	4	47
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>339</b>
Barton	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	19	16	2	0	1	2	49
Cedar	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	66	7	6	0	0	10	92
Dade	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	1	0	5	1	0	32
Vernon	0	3	3	1	0	1	1	23	22	54	9	22	27	166
<b>29</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>135</b>
Jasper	14	17	32	2	1	6	0	23	8	21	1	0	10	135
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>412</b>
Dallas	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	1	8	13	49
Hickory	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	5	2	5	2	8	30
Polk	0	3	10	4	0	0	1	4	33	51	30	15	51	202
Webster	0	4	20	0	0	0	2	1	7	42	9	16	30	131
<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>349</b>
Greene	3	48	47	6	3	4	1	30	74	71	49	10	3	349
<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>365</b>
Bollinger	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4	1	1	2	25
Cape Girardeau	2	7	28	0	0	2	0	7	108	74	17	22	33	300
Perry	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	1	8	0	2	40
<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>294</b>
Mississippi	3	8	2	0	0	0	2	3	17	1	1	3	19	59
Scott	0	11	7	0	0	0	0	40	66	25	11	15	60	235
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>197</b>
New Madrid	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	10	16	0	2	3	7	51
Pemiscot	0	19	11	0	0	0	0	24	38	1	0	6	47	146
<b>35</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>238</b>
Dunklin	1	1	19	0	0	7	0	0	0	38	0	0	1	67
Stoddard	2	9	7	0	0	22	2	45	65	0	13	6	0	171
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>329</b>
Carter	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	0	2	3	20
Butler	0	12	33	0	0	1	0	58	13	102	2	9	56	286
Ripley	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	2	0	3	23

## Appendix B: Law Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>218</b>
Howell	2	4	29	0	1	1	0	59	20	29	3	12	12	172
Oregon	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	1	7	11	37
Shannon	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	9
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>294</b>
Christian	0	23	28	1	1	3	0	80	61	36	19	25	17	294
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>356</b>
Barry	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	15	15	44	4	2	13	107
Lawrence	0	2	2	1	1	0	0	52	8	27	13	5	15	126
Stone	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	69	0	31	7	1	6	123
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>374</b>
McDonald	0	5	27	0		0	0	41	39	7	0	5	11	135
Newton	0	5	14	0	1	1	0	5	32	45	14	60	62	239
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>52</b>
Macon	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	5	2	2	2	6	31
Shelby	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	2	0	3	21
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>68</b>
Crawford	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	7	4	11	37
Dent	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	1	22
Iron	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Reynolds														0
Wayne	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>227</b>
Caldwell	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	1	6	3	26
Clinton	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	2	1	8	38
Daviess	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	10	2	3	3	29
DeKalb	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	8
Livingston	0	3	15	0	0	0	0	3	38	34	8	2	23	126
<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>79</b>
Douglas	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	1	0	13
Ozark	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	9
Wright	0	2	5	0	0	1	0	6	23	3	0	16	1	57
<b>45</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>242</b>
Lincoln	1	9	8	0	0	1	4	33	57	49	19	3	22	206
Pike	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	15	2	1	7	36
<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>202</b>
Taney	0	14	12	1	0	0	0	36	23	50	19	8	39	202
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>712</b>	<b>1,593</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>2,653</b>	<b>2,812</b>	<b>3,449</b>	<b>1,496</b>	<b>713</b>	<b>3,582</b>	<b>17,950</b>

## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>152</b>
Clark	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	19	49	0	7	13	94
Schuyler	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	12	7	0	1	7	30
Scotland	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	10	12	0	1	0	28
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>104</b>
Adair	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	7	4	19	1	53
Knox	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	0	0	0	14
Lewis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	17	0	5	4	37
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>146</b>
Grundy	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	10	31	0	8	8	62
Harrison	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	0	8	5	31
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	3	2	16
Putnam	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	9	0	4	4	37
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>346</b>
Atchison	0	0	1	0	0	0	15	17	0	1	0	6	40
Gentry	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	1	2	1	0	35
Holt	0	0	6	0	0	0	7	15	0	0	0	4	32
Nodaway	0	1	5	0	0	0	135	45	4	0	14	31	235
Worth	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>549</b>
Andrew	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	10	1	0	0	0	21
Buchanan	0	29	11	0	0	1	84	233	63	1	96	10	528
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>66</b>
Platte	0	2	5	0	0	0	7	25	18	0	0	9	66
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>
Clay	0	7	3	0	0	0	3	16	2	0	1	0	32
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80</b>
Carroll	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	5	0	0	0	18
Ray	0	0	6	0	0	0	23	4	29	0	0	0	62
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>89</b>
Chariton	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	2	3	6	19
Linn	0	1	3	0	0	0	3	8	15	0	4	12	46
Sullivan	0	0	3	0	0	0	4	4	10	0	0	3	24
<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>155</b>
Marion	0	0	0	5	0	0	75	45	0	0	1	13	139
Monroe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Ralls	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	6	14
<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>253</b>
St. Charles	0	0	1	0	0	0	22	58	63	24	4	81	253
<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>399</b>
Audrain	0	1	9	0	0	0	15	51	90	1	3	4	174
Montgomery	0	3	4	0	0	0	28	21	30	0	8	1	95
Warren	0	1	0	0	0	0	26	19	63	2	3	16	130

## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>889</b>
Boone	0	9	118	0	0	1	119	30	280	43	10	9	619
Callaway	0	3	22	0	0	1	3	19	206	11	5	0	270
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>369</b>
Howard	0	14	3	0	0	1	3	11	27	2	21	6	88
Randolph	0	44	4	0	0	5	31	55	73	12	50	7	281
<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>304</b>
Lafayette	0	1	8	0	0	1	16	27	64	2	11	18	148
Saline	0	1	0	0	0	0	23	20	94	2	2	14	156
<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>90</b>
Jackson	13	1	12	0	0	7	0	0	1	7	3	46	90
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>567</b>
Cass	0	7	28	0	0	0	78	73	176	15	0	13	390
Johnson	0	1	3	0	0	0	71	43	39	6	0	14	177
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>222</b>
Cooper	0	0	8	0	0	0	12	18	47	1	1	1	88
Pettis	0	0	10	1	0	1	49	31	20	2	15	5	134
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>179</b>
Cole	0	1	0	0	0	31	12	19	88	16	8	4	179
<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>188</b>
Franklin	0	2	0	0	0	1	39	18	71	4	8	22	165
Gasconade	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	0	0	0	13
Osage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	10
<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>552</b>	<b>1,280</b>
St. Louis Co.	0	0	0	7	24	0	54	62	384	176	21	552	1,280
<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>170</b>
St. Louis City	2	3	0	0	0	4	5	30	37	6	0	83	170
<b>23</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>614</b>
Jefferson	13	23	56	0	0	33	19	59	317	16	24	54	614
<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>212</b>
Madison	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	2	3	1	3	24
St. Francois	0	1	2	0	0	0	31	6	60	1	2	6	109
Ste. Genevieve	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	18	1	0	0	23
Washington	1	0	1	0	0	0	18	7	27	0	0	2	56
<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>916</b>
Maries	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	3	6	15
Phelps	0	2	9	0	0	0	69	20	9	0	65	108	282
Pulaski	0	2	4	0	0	2	177	36	1	0	35	20	277
Texas	0	0	0	0	0	0	231	7	0	24	79	1	342

## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>406</b>
Camden	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	8	43	1	27	4	99
Laclede	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	52	13	5	37	25	190
Miller	0	2	2	3	0	0	5	4	19	3	0	12	50
Moniteau	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	17	3	0	0	30
Morgan	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4	15	0	0	10	37
<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>223</b>
Bates	0	1	3	0	0	5	9	21	18	1	1	5	64
Benton	0	4	1	0	0	0	5	8	5	1	0	0	24
Henry	0	1	0	0	0	0	41	23	8	10	6	3	92
St. Clair	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	24	6	2	2	5	43
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>370</b>
Barton	0	3	3	0	0	0	58	4	7	0	1	0	76
Cedar	0	4	0	0	0	0	45	1	6	0	3	1	60
Dade	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	1	0	1	0	14
Vernon	0	6	6	1	0	0	52	14	103	8	25	5	220
<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
Jasper	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	10
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>165</b>
Dallas	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	0	4	3	15
Hickory	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	3	14
Polk	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	28	34	24	6	95
Webster	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	1	5	1	41
<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>
Greene	0	3	1	0	0	1	3	3	12	8	0	0	31
<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>707</b>
Bollinger	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	64	0	0	1	107
Cape Girardeau	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	34	249	4	27	6	442
Perry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	45	3	1	10	158
<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>129</b>
Mississippi	1	3	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	2	6	22
Scott	0	2	5	0	0	0	27	18	14	9	8	24	107
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>391</b>
New Madrid	0	1	1	0	0	0	62	39	3	1	6	32	145
Pemiscot	0	0	1	0	0	0	134	67	2	0	15	27	246
<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>195</b>
Dunklin	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	50	0	0	0	55
Stoddard	0	0	1	0	0	0	27	95	1	10	6	0	140
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>97</b>
Carter	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Butler	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	1	73	0	4	1	87
Ripley	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	7

## Appendix C: Status Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>278</b>
Howell	0	2	2	0	0	1	129	21	22	4	9	32	222
Oregon	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4	0	23	3	39
Shannon	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	5	0	1	3	17
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>570</b>
Christian	0	41	19	1	0	1	165	74	56	15	138	60	570
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>244</b>
Barry	0	0	1	0	0	0	20	17	40	1	0	2	81
Lawrence	0	0	2	0	0	0	24	3	41	5	8	5	88
Stone	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	3	37	5	2	2	75
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>265</b>
McDonald	0	2	3	0	0	0	48	24	7	0	11	5	100
Newton	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	28	34	9	64	16	165
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>172</b>
Macon	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	26	18	1	1	13	130
Shelby	0	0	2	0	0	0	7	30	2	0	1	0	42
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>117</b>
Crawford	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3	6	20
Dent	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	35	5	0	0	0	44
Iron	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	13	0	27
Reynolds	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	13
Wayne	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	1	0	13
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>159</b>
Caldwell	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	0	8	2	24
Clinton	0	0	3	0	0	0	5	4	16	1	3	5	37
Daviess	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	11	0	0	2	20
DeKalb	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	7
Livingston	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	16	28	6	0	19	71
<b>44</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>
Douglas	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	4
Ozark	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Wright	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	1	0	9
<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>302</b>
Lincoln	0	2	6	0	0	2	22	38	111	10	1	81	273
Pike	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	0	2	10	29
<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>139</b>
Taney	0	3	2	1	0	2	29	20	50	8	6	18	139
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>2,866</b>	<b>2,254</b>	<b>3,985</b>	<b>559</b>	<b>1,068</b>	<b>1,716</b>	<b>13,357</b>



# Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>87</b>
Clark	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	2	19	22	57
Schuyler	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	20
Scotland	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	10
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>103</b>
Adair	0	60	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	9	5	79
Knox	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7
Lewis	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	17
<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>151</b>
Grundy	1	7	4	0	0	0	1	24	10	1	40	9	97
Harrison	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	16	1	30
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Putnam	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	20
<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>235</b>
Atchison	0	15	2	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	1	9	33
Gentry	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	4	6	26
Holt	0	14	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	10	32
Nodaway	1	54	1	0	0	0	41	1	0	0	5	39	142
Worth	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>132</b>
Andrew	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	6
Buchanan	0	58	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	51	8	126
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33</b>
Platte	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	33
<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>355</b>
Clay	9	79	2	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	253	355
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>
Carroll	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Ray	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	6	0	0	0	13
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>72</b>
Chariton	0	12	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	22
Linn	0	17	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	24
Sullivan	0	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	0	2	4	26
<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>
Marion	0	3	1	19	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	26
Monroe	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Ralls	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
<b>11</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>154</b>
St. Charles	41	88	0	0	4	5	1	2	0	11	0	2	154
<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>174</b>
Audrain	0	11	0	0	0	0	6	8	8	0	7	1	41
Montgomery	0	10	1	0	0	0	3	15	3	0	14	0	46
Warren	0	35	0	0	0	0	8	6	8	0	21	9	87

## Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>304</b>
Boone	0	179	12	0	1	0	1	0	4	0	0	2	199
Callaway	0	60	12	0	0	0	29	0	3	0	1	0	105
<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>187</b>
Howard	0	21	4	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	11	0	53
Randolph	0	60	5	0	0	1	4	4	38	6	15	1	134
<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>30</b>
Lafayette	0	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	19
Saline	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11
<b>16</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>790</b>
Jackson	171	352	27	0	16	30	0	0	0	7	4	183	790
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>351</b>
Cass	0	93	1	0	0	0	3	1	151	3	0	14	266
Johnson	0	55	12	0	0	0	2	3	12	0	0	1	85
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>83</b>
Cooper	0	4	1	0	0	0	8	9	14	0	1	9	46
Pettis	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	21	0	0	1	7	37
<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>66</b>
Cole	0	37	7	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	7	9	66
<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>117</b>
Franklin	0	96	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
Gasconade	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	17
Osage	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
<b>21</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>842</b>
St. Louis Co.	75	266	41	39	48	12	5	4	50	30	0	272	842
<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>524</b>
St. Louis City	20	358	3	0	3	40	3	1	54	4	0	38	524
<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>662</b>
Jefferson	8	190	3	0	0	33	0	0	0	2	393	33	662
<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>162</b>
Madison	3	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
St. Francois	0	67	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	74
Ste. Genevieve	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Washington	0	26	9	0	5	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	48
<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>491</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>1,215</b>
Maries	0	8	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	12	30
Phelps	0	102	2	0	1	4	27	3	32	0	117	96	384
Pulaski	0	129	0	0	0	14	198	8	0	0	150	22	521
Texas	0	34	0	0	0	0	19	2	0	4	219	2	280

# Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>356</b>
Camden	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	1	26	7	110
Laclede	0	18	0	0	0	0	4	2	81	1	3	23	132
Miller	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	1	24	2	75
Moniteau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4
Morgan	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	1	35
<b>27</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>345</b>
Bates	0	19	5	1	0	9	10	8	55	1	16	0	124
Benton	9	27	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	2	3	51
Henry	0	21	5	1	0	0	58	6	24	1	8	1	125
St. Clair	0	8	6	0	0	4	6	3	11	0	7	0	45
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>189</b>
Barton	0	8	2	0	0	0	17	3	4	0	0	6	40
Cedar	0	28	0	0	0	0	25	0	1	0	0	0	54
Dade	0	6	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	2	0	21
Vernon	0	19	4	0	0	1	30	0	8	0	1	11	74
<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>163</b>
Jasper	0	140	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	163
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>349</b>
Dallas	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	16	3	42
Hickory	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	2	11
Polk	0	30	7	0	0	0	0	0	17	3	51	4	112
Webster	0	40	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	120	2	184
<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>426</b>
Greene	0	313	8	0	0	41	0	0	0	3	11	50	426
<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>383</b>
Bollinger	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	6	3	24
Cape Girardeau	0	38	29	0	1	0	0	143	6	1	35	10	263
Perry	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	47	18	3	13	3	96
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>51</b>
Mississippi	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Scott	0	32	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	36
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>212</b>
New Madrid	0	55	0		0	0	0	0	0	1	23	3	82
Pemiscot	0	64	3	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	50	5	130
<b>35</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>413</b>
Dunklin	2	36	1	0	1	15	0	0	61	2	0	2	120
Stoddard	0	95	0	0	0	21	49	47	0	8	72	1	293
<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>218</b>
Carter	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Butler	0	104	19	2	0	4	3	25	13	1	0	0	171
Ripley	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	33

# Appendix D: CA/N Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>106</b>
Howell	0	29	1	0	1	7	6	0	0	0	33	5	82
Oregon	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Shannon	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	15
<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>201</b>
Christian	0	58	3	0	0	0	4	30	0	3	49	54	201
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>288</b>
Barry	0	45	0	0	0	0	104	0	4	0	3	2	158
Lawrence	0	38	0	0	0	0	27	0	4	0	1	2	72
Stone	0	32	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	1	9	0	58
<b>40</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>251</b>
McDonald	0	36	0	0	0	12	19	0	0	0	12	9	88
Newton	1	75	1	0	1	46	0	0	1	1	27	10	163
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38</b>
Macon	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	22
Shelby	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	16
<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>158</b>
Crawford	0	47	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Dent	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Iron	0	34	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	44
Reynolds	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	20
Wayne	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	16
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>276</b>
Caldwell	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	15
Clinton	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	27
Daviess	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	2	34
DeKalb	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	14
Livingston	0	26	2	0	0	0	0	11	0	2	14	131	186
<b>44</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>36</b>
Douglas	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Ozark	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Wright	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	22
<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>280</b>
Lincoln	0	54	0	1	0	5	1	0	5	0	1	188	255
Pike	0	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	5	25
<b>46</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>186</b>
Taney	21	121	0	0	0	7	0	22	5	0	4	6	186
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>4,788</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>780</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>936</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>1,840</b>	<b>1,674</b>	<b>11,802</b>

# Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Schuyler	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Nodaway	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4
<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>
Andrew	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	18
Buchanan	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	211	1	0	0	0	222
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Platte	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Clay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Ray	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
St. Charles	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4
<b>16</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>177</b>
Jackson	31	40	22	1	2	23	1	0	0	0	8	2	47	177
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Cass	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Johnson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Pettis	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>137</b>
St. Louis Co.	22	4	5	34	57	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	137
<b>22</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>84</b>
St. Louis City	13	26	20	0	1	17	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	84
<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Jefferson	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
Pulaski	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
Camden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Laclede	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Miller	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moniteau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morgan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Bates	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>
Vernon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	5
<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>
Hickory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Dallas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	4
Polk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5

## Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
Webster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>
Scott	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	19
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
New Madrid	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pemiscot	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

# Appendix E: Administrative Referral Outcomes by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Missing	True Out of Home	True In Home	True No Service	Not True	Dismiss	Juvenile Certified	Informal without Supervision	Informal with Supervision	No Action	Transfer Other Court	Transfer Other Agency	Reject	Total
<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Dunklin	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Stoddard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>
Howell	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	0	1	0	18
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
Barry	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>
Newton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
McDonald	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	12	13	4	0	1	0	40
<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Macon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Livingston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Lincoln	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>762</b>

## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>273</b>
Clark	57	1	3	12	5	94	2	174
Schuyler	20	1	2	2	2	30	0	57
Scotland	10	1	0	2	1	28	0	42
<b>2</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>319</b>
Adair	79	2	7	26	17	53	7	191
Knox	7	0	0	0	1	14	8	30
Lewis	17	3	14	13	10	37	4	98
<b>3</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>389</b>
Grundy	97	6	0	21	17	62	12	215
Harrison	30	2	0	12	11	31	4	90
Mercer	4	0	0	0	0	16	1	21
Putnam	20	1	2	2	0	37	1	63
<b>4</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>712</b>
Atchison	33	0	0	3	0	40	3	79
Gentry	26	3	0	3	12	35	1	80
Holt	32	0	0	0	0	32	0	64
Nodaway	142	17	8	19	31	235	26	478
Worth	2	1	0	0	1	4	3	11
<b>5</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>549</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1,221</b>
Andrew	6	32	0	8	7	21	2	76
Buchanan	126	321	5	111	52	528	2	1,145
<b>6</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>415</b>
Platte	33	62	60	83	60	66	51	415
<b>7</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>763</b>
Clay	355	23	18	174	97	32	64	763
<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>159</b>
Carroll	1	0	0	8	4	18	1	32
Ray	13	6	0	19	24	63	2	127
<b>9</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>197</b>
Chariton	22	0	0	0	0	19	0	41
Linn	24	8	0	11	11	46	1	101
Sullivan	26	1	1	1	1	24	1	55
<b>10</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>393</b>
Marion	26	30	40	35	26	139	27	323
Monroe	4	1	0	3	1	2	0	11
Ralls	4	7	10	9	11	14	4	59
<b>11</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>1,310</b>
St. Charles	154	55	70	377	265	260	129	1,310
<b>12</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>837</b>
Audrain	41	12	4	29	47	175	15	323
Montgomery	46	4	4	25	8	95	6	188
Warren	87	37	3	45	19	130	5	326



## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>2,006</b>
Boone	199	68	75	278	154	619	24	1,417
Callaway	105	26	32	99	37	270	20	589
<b>14</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>662</b>
Howard	53	4	6	11	5	88	5	172
Randolph	134	25	16	13	14	281	7	490
<b>15</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>655</b>
Lafayette	19	27	20	76	33	148	19	342
Saline	11	71	0	56	17	157	1	313
<b>16</b>	<b>790</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1,910</b>
Jackson	790	278	29	402	286	90	35	1,910
<b>17</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1,613</b>
Cass	266	64	46	253	94	390	71	1,184
Johnson	85	20	17	67	39	177	24	429
<b>18</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>643</b>
Cooper	46	16	36	78	36	88	10	310
Pettis	37	21	2	81	45	134	13	333
<b>19</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>534</b>
Cole	66	35	21	109	88	179	36	534
<b>20</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>731</b>
Franklin	97	25	33	103	91	165	116	630
Gasconade	17	3	0	12	11	13	7	63
Osage	3	7	7	6	4	10	1	38
<b>21</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>1,079</b>	<b>1,454</b>	<b>1,283</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>5,530</b>
St. Louis Co.	842	561	117	1,079	1,454	1,283	194	5,530
<b>22</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1,718</b>
St. Louis City	524	186	20	255	551	170	12	1,718
<b>23</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>2,239</b>
Jefferson	662	121	48	487	209	614	98	2,239
<b>24</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>766</b>
Madison	31	12	1	12	5	24	1	86
St. Francois	74	15	29	164	57	109	37	485
Ste. Genevieve	9	5	7	19	14	23	2	79
Washington	48	3	0	5	3	56	1	116
<b>25</b>	<b>1,215</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>917</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>2,539</b>
Maries	30	3	0	2	1	15	1	52
Phelps	384	6	3	66	52	283	16	810
Pulaski	521	41	14	82	36	277	46	1,017
Texas	280	4	0	13	15	342	6	660
<b>26</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>1,178</b>
Camden	110	6	7	41	17	99	26	306
Laclede	132	13	26	50	20	190	24	455
Miller	75	20	17	40	24	50	11	237
Moniteau	4	2	2	13	10	30	0	61
Morgan	35	15	0	20	10	37	2	119

## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>27</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>708</b>
Bates	124	6	2	22	12	64	5	235
Benton	51	1	0	10	7	24	2	95
Henry	125	5	0	10	6	92	5	243
St. Clair	45	5	3	26	7	43	6	135
<b>28</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>370</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>903</b>
Barton	40	7	2	27	6	76	7	165
Cedar	54	5	4	20	30	60	33	206
Dade	21	9	1	9	9	14	4	67
Vernon	74	26	27	62	24	220	32	465
<b>29</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>308</b>
Jasper	163	13	5	67	49	10	1	308
<b>30</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>937</b>
Dallas	42	14	4	23	8	15	4	110
Hickory	11	9	2	12	6	14	2	56
Polk	112	56	16	87	34	95	14	414
Webster	184	24	16	53	24	41	15	357
<b>31</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>806</b>
Greene	426	30	21	178	98	31	22	806
<b>32</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>711</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1,455</b>
Bollinger	24	3	0	12	6	107	4	156
Cape Girardeau	263	41	14	113	97	442	35	1,005
Perry	96	19	0	13	0	162	4	294
<b>33</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>493</b>
Mississippi	15	10	8	19	20	22	2	96
Scott	36	67	39	80	55	107	13	397
<b>34</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>803</b>
New Madrid	82	7	6	14	16	145	10	280
Pemiscot	130	22	19	70	23	246	13	523
<b>35</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>848</b>
Dunklin	120	14	11	23	19	55	1	243
Stoddard	293	24	52	46	17	140	33	605
<b>36</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>644</b>
Carter	14	0	0	6	7	3	7	37
Butler	171	35	16	136	69	87	30	544
Ripley	33	2	0	8	10	7	3	63
<b>37</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>620</b>
Howell	82	79	8	44	38	222	21	494
Oregon	9	14	3	12	8	39	0	85
Shannon	15	2	0	1	2	17	4	41

## Appendix F: Type of Referrals by Circuit and County

Circuit/County	Miscellaneous	People	Property	Peace Disturbance	Substance	Status	CA/N	Total
<b>38</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1,065</b>
Christian	201	46	28	100	69	570	51	1,065
<b>39</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>890</b>
Barry	158	13	1	45	21	81	29	348
Lawrence	72	28	5	45	25	88	23	286
Stone	58	28	13	53	21	75	8	256
<b>40</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>932</b>
McDonald	88	61	12	34	44	100	24	363
Newton	163	46	34	76	31	165	54	569
<b>41</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>262</b>
Macon	22	7	9	6	7	130	2	183
Shelby	16	10	0	6	5	42	0	79
<b>42</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>343</b>
Crawford	48	8	0	13	9	20	7	105
Dent	30	12	0	2	2	44	6	96
Iron	44	0	0	3	2	27	0	76
Reynolds	20	0	0	0	0	13	0	33
Wayne	16	0	0	3	1	13	0	33
<b>43</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>662</b>
Caldwell	15	3	1	10	6	24	6	65
Clinton	27	5	3	11	14	37	5	102
Daviess	34	8	3	10	4	20	4	83
DeKalb	14	1	1	5	0	7	1	29
Livingston	186	22	16	30	26	71	32	383
<b>44</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>131</b>
Douglas	7	1	2	10	0	4	0	24
Ozark	7	1	1	3	2	3	2	19
Wright	22	10	4	21	15	9	7	88
<b>45</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>825</b>
Lincoln	255	19	29	93	40	275	24	735
Pike	25	7	4	10	11	29	4	90
<b>46</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>486</b>
Taney	186	18	14	86	43	139		486
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>11,802</b>	<b>3,243</b>	<b>1,341</b>	<b>6,923</b>	<b>5,278</b>	<b>13,377</b>	<b>1,869</b>	<b>43,833</b>

# Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>
Clark	0	1	0	6	2	0	0	0	9	2	0	3	0	0	23
Schuyler	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	6
Scotland	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	4
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>112</b>
Adair	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	16	8	5	9	0	0	59
Knox	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	9
Lewis	0	0	0	6	11	0	1	0	7	12	2	5	0	0	44
<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>
Grundy	0	0	0	12	6	0	0	0	14	5	3	16	0	0	56
Harrison	0	1	0	3	11	1	0	0	5	2	2	4	0	0	29
Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Putnam	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	6
<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>127</b>
Atchison	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	6
Gentry	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	11	2	2	0	0	19
Holt															0
Nodaway	0	0	0	9	5	0	2	0	31	13	4	33	0	0	97
Worth	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	5
<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>300</b>
Andrew	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	13	1	3	2	0	4	31
Buchanan	11	6	0	15	20	4	8	0	97	27	11	5	1	64	269
<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>313</b>
Platte	1	1	0	25	19	2	39	0	78	47	43	58	0	0	313
<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>376</b>
Clay	1	5	2	29	43	4	5	0	99	51	74	63	0	0	376
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>
Carroll	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	5	3	0	1	0	0	13
Ray	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	1	36	5	1	1	0	0	52
<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>36</b>
Chariton															0
Linn	1	1	1	8	1	1	0	0	12	1	0	2	0	3	31
Sullivan	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5
<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>204</b>
Marion	5	2	0	19	14	2	9	0	45	37	6	17	0	2	158
Monroe	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Ralls	0	3	0	1	3	0	6	0	12	10	3	3	0	0	41
<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>899</b>
St. Charles	16	17	7	106	110	9	2	7	402	93	33	97	0	0	899
<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>263</b>
Audrain	0	4	0	28	18	0	0	0	29	4	12	11	0	1	107
Montgomery	1	0	0	4	5	1	2	0	21	4	1	5	0	3	47
Warren	4	0	1	8	8	3	1	0	32	10	5	5	1	31	109
<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>813</b>
Boone	13	13	3	79	92	4	5	0	259	90	20	21	0	0	599
Callaway	1	9	2	18	29	4	2	0	77	32	18	21	0	1	214

# Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>106</b>
Howard	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	0	4	5	8	1	0	4	31
Randolph	3	0	0	12	4	0	0	0	6	20	6	2	0	22	75
<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>321</b>
Lafayette	7	8	1	14	19	2	4	0	80	18	3	11	0	8	175
Saline	0	0	0	6	5	1	0	1	61	6	1	0	35	30	146
<b>16</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>853</b>
Jackson	77	85	13	199	103	46	3	0	239	46	15	26	0	1	853
<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>694</b>
Cass	5	8	1	58	64	1	27	0	204	81	11	67	0	0	527
Johnson	1	2	4	11	18	3	6	0	54	26	8	34	0	0	167
<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>335</b>
Cooper	1	3	3	4	5	1	3	0	106	34	0	12	2	2	176
Pettis	8	2	0	22	10	1	3	0	60	21	11	21	0	0	159
<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>289</b>
Cole	3	7	2	39	32	2	0	0	118	41	6	33	6	0	289
<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>426</b>
Franklin	1	0	1	23	39	4	1	0	87	47	15	150	0	0	368
Gasconade	1	0	0	6	2	2	0	0	10	3	2	7	0	0	33
Osage	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	11	5	2	2	0	0	25
<b>21</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>3,270</b>
St. Louis Co.	86	96	24	778	239	100	44	2	1,175	379	164	154	5	24	3,270
<b>22</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>940</b>
St. Louis City	76	44	2	293	84	9	3	0	311	67	9	26	0	16	940
<b>23</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>963</b>
Jefferson	6	18	2	123	79	18	20	0	474	114	16	82	0	11	963
<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>392</b>
Madison	1	4	1	4	4	0	0	0	6	2	0	3	1	5	31
St. Francois	6	5	2	17	44	1	3	0	63	50	80	31	0	0	302
Ste. Genevieve	0	3	0	2	4	0	0	0	19	13	2	3	0	1	47
Washington	1	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	12
<b>25</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>405</b>
Maries	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	7
Phelps	2	2	1	14	30	5	2	0	53	13	6	15	0	0	143
Pulaski	1	5	1	25	22	2	11	0	81	12	11	44	1	1	217
Texas	2	1	0	6	2	1	1	0	6	8	0	11	0	0	38
<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>414</b>
Camden	0	1	0	15	7	1	0	0	42	8	3	19	0	1	97
Laclede	0	2	1	10	10	2	4	0	23	26	27	25	0	1	131
Miller	0	5	1	13	20	3	1	0	39	7	6	11	1	5	112
Moniteau	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	14	3	2	0	0	2	27
Morgan	2	2	2	12	5	1	0	0	12	8	2	1	0	0	47

# Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>27</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>139</b>
Bates	1	1	0	2	13	0	6	0	7	5	4	5	0	2	46
Benton	1	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	4	1	2	5	0	1	20
Henry	2	0	0	4	4	1	0	0	2	1	4	5	0	3	26
St. Clair	1	2	1	4	15	0	2	0	7	0	8	7	0	0	47
<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>339</b>
Barton	1	4	0	4	5	3	1	0	19	2	0	10	0	0	49
Cedar	0	2	1	5	13	1	3	0	18	14	0	35	0	0	92
Dade	1	0	0	1	6	0	5	0	11	3	0	5	0	0	32
Vernon	1	4	3	6	19	1	7	0	52	34	9	30	0	0	166
<b>29</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>135</b>
Jasper	2	3	2	18	35	0	0	0	47	21	3	4	0	0	135
<b>30</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>412</b>
Dallas	1	1	1	2	7	0	0	0	26	8	1	2	0	0	49
Hickory	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	9	3	3	2	0	5	30
Polk	1	1	2	11	29	4	0	0	63	24	16	15	0	36	202
Webster	5	2	0	23	22	1	2	0	45	17	2	12	0	0	131
<b>31</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>349</b>
Greene	11	11	0	63	75	2	2	0	108	21	22	34	0	0	349
<b>32</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>365</b>
Bollinger	0	1	1	1	2	3	1	0	2	4	3	5	0	2	25
Cape Girardeau	16	14	1	33	55	3	3	0	83	31	15	31	0	15	300
Perry	2	0	0	3	6	0	4	4	7	0	0	1	0	13	40
<b>33</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>294</b>
Mississippi	2	1	4	9	10	0	0	0	18	11	0	3	0	1	59
Scott	1	4	3	36	24	5	3	0	81	49	4	18	0	7	235
<b>34</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>197</b>
New Madrid	0	0	0	16	3	0	0	0	16	7	1	8	0	0	51
Pemiscot	7	5	2	16	18	3	0	0	61	20	3	9	2	0	146
<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>238</b>
Dunklin	0	4	0	13	18	0	0	0	13	7	3	5	0	4	67
Stoddard	1	1	0	9	15	1	5	0	52	24	26	36	1	0	171
<b>36</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>329</b>
Carter	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	0	6	0	0	7	0	0	20
Butler	8	1	0	44	49	5	1	0	106	40	2	30	0	0	286
Ripley	0	2	0	5	2	3	0	0	5	3	0	3	0	0	23
<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>218</b>
Howell	17	0	1	22	17	0	46	0	40	11	4	11	0	3	172
Oregon	0	0	0	2	10	0	3	0	14	4	1	1	0	2	37
Shannon	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	9
<b>38</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>294</b>
Christian	4	1	1	27	42	3	4	0	88	45	23	56	0	0	294
<b>39</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>356</b>
Barry	1	3	1	12	6	3	0	0	28	13	0	31	9	0	107
Lawrence	1	0	3	11	16	2	0	0	39	9	1	30	14	0	126
Stone	1	6	3	9	8	2	0	0	37	29	0	15	13	0	123

# Appendix G: Law Referrals by Level, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Felony A	Felony B	Felony C	Felony D	Felony E	Felony U	Infraction	Juvenile	Misdemeanor A	Misdemeanor B	Misdemeanor C	Misdemeanor D	Misdemeanor U	Ordinance	Total
<b>40</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>374</b>
McDonald	1	6	1	21	28	2	1	0	45	9	2	19	0	0	135
Newton	1	4	2	24	21	6	4	0	99	43	5	30	0	0	239
<b>41</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>52</b>
Macon	1	1	0	1	12	0	1	0	6	1	0	3	0	5	31
Shelby	1	0	0	3	5	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	21
<b>42</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>68</b>
Crawford	2	1	0	3	2	0	1	0	12	4	1	10	0	1	37
Dent	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	5	0	1	7	0	0	22
Iron	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	5
Reynolds															0
Wayne	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>227</b>
Caldwell	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	7	4	3	6	0	0	26
Clinton	0	1	0	3	6	0	0	0	17	5	2	4	0	0	38
Daviess	0	0	0	3	5	0	3	0	8	4	3	3	0	0	29
DeKalb	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	8
Livingston	0	0	0	8	5	0	15	0	43	16	0	39	0	0	126
<b>44</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>79</b>
Douglas	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	13
Ozark	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	9
Wright	1	4	0	11	12	0	3	0	12	4	2	8	0	0	57
<b>45</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>242</b>
Lincoln	0	5	0	17	16	4	10	2	95	29	0	28	0	0	206
Pike	0	0	0	1	7	0	1	0	12	9	0	5	0	1	36
<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>202</b>
Taney	0	1	0	14	20	0	2	0	90	21	7	47	0	0	202
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>2,655</b>	<b>1,998</b>	<b>302</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6,253</b>	<b>2,150</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>1,878</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>17,950</b>

# Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>87</b>
Clark	19	0	38	57
Schuyler	11	0	9	20
Scotland	3	0	7	10
<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>103</b>
Adair	3	1	75	79
Knox	0	0	7	7
Lewis	5	0	12	17
<b>3</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>151</b>
Grundy	11	0	86	97
Harrison	0	0	30	30
Mercer	4	0	0	4
Putnam	10	0	10	20
<b>4</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>235</b>
Atchison	3	0	30	33
Gentry	0	0	26	26
Holt	2	0	30	32
Nodaway	12	0	130	142
Worth	0	0	2	2
<b>5</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>132</b>
Andrew	2	0	4	6
Buchanan	61	0	65	126
<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>33</b>
Platte	4	0	29	33
<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>355</b>
Clay	8	21	326	355
<b>8</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>
Carroll	1	0	0	1
Ray	10	0	3	13
<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>72</b>
Chariton	0	0	22	22
Linn	0	1	23	24
Sullivan	0	11	15	26
<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>34</b>
Marion	1	0	25	26
Monroe	0	0	4	4
Ralls	0	1	3	4
<b>11</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>154</b>
St. Charles	23	37	94	154
<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>174</b>
Audrain	12	2	27	41
Montgomery	7	2	37	46
Warren	3	3	81	87
<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>304</b>
Boone	5	13	181	199
Callaway	1	3	101	105



## Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>14</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>187</b>
Howard	18	0	35	53
Randolph	47	0	87	134
<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>30</b>
Lafayette	3	1	15	19
Saline	0	10	1	11
<b>16</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>790</b>
Jackson	202	127	461	790
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>351</b>
Cass	0	18	248	266
Johnson	0	23	62	85
<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>83</b>
Cooper	7	16	23	46
Pettis	6	1	30	37
<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>66</b>
Cole	1	0	65	66
<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>
Franklin	0	0	97	97
Gasconade	0	0	17	17
Osage	0	0	3	3
<b>21</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>842</b>
St. Louis Co.	189	192	461	842
<b>22</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>524</b>
St. Louis City	34	90	400	524
<b>23</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>662</b>
Jefferson	415	93	154	662
<b>24</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>162</b>
Madison	2	0	29	31
St. Francois	4	0	70	74
Ste. Genevieve	8	0	1	9
Washington	4	0	44	48
<b>25</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>904</b>	<b>1,215</b>
Maries	0	0	30	30
Phelps	16	13	355	384
Pulaski	194	3	324	521
Texas	83	2	195	280
<b>26</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>356</b>
Camden	27	62	21	110
Laclede	20	80	32	132
Miller	23	42	10	75
Moniteau	1	1	2	4
Morgan	1	28	6	35
<b>27</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>345</b>
Bates	9	0	115	124
Benton	3	2	46	51
Henry	12	1	112	125
St. Clair	6	0	39	45

# Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>28</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>189</b>
Barton	5	5	30	40
Cedar	3	9	42	54
Dade	0	0	21	21
Vernon	3	7	64	74
<b>29</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>163</b>
Jasper	14	0	149	163
<b>30</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>349</b>
Dallas	6	4	32	42
Hickory	1	2	8	11
Polk	22	34	56	112
Webster	44	13	127	184
<b>31</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>426</b>
Greene	63	74	289	426
<b>32</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>383</b>
Bollinger	10	0	14	24
Cape Girardeau	46	2	215	263
Perry	0	0	96	96
<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>
Mississippi	0	0	15	15
Scott	0	0	36	36
<b>34</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>212</b>
New Madrid	26	2	54	82
Pemiscot	33	7	90	130
<b>35</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>413</b>
Dunklin	2	0	118	120
Stoddard	40	81	172	293
<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>218</b>
Carter	0	0	14	14
Butler	0	0	171	171
Ripley	1	0	32	33
<b>37</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>106</b>
Howell	11	33	38	82
Oregon	0	9	0	9
Shannon	0	15	0	15
<b>38</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>201</b>
Christian	62	26	113	201
<b>39</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>288</b>
Barry	7	40	111	158
Lawrence	5	38	29	72
Stone	9	31	18	58
<b>40</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>251</b>
McDonald	18	0	70	88
Newton	26	3	134	163

# Appendix H: CA/N Referrals by Type, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Abuse	Juvenile Request for Protective Custody	Juvenile Neglect	Total
<b>41</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>38</b>
Macon	0	0	22	22
Shelby	4	0	12	16
<b>42</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>158</b>
Crawford	5	0	43	48
Dent	1	0	29	30
Iron	0	0	44	44
Reynolds	0	0	20	20
Wayne	0	0	16	16
<b>43</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>276</b>
Caldwell	5	1	9	15
Clinton	11	0	16	27
Daviess	3	0	31	34
DeKalb	3	0	11	14
Livingston	94	0	92	186
<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>
Douglas	0	0	7	7
Ozark	0	0	7	7
Wright	0	0	22	22
<b>45</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>280</b>
Lincoln	139	6	110	255
Pike	2	3	20	25
<b>46</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>186</b>
Taney	8	45	133	186
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>2,288</b>	<b>1,390</b>	<b>8,124</b>	<b>11,802</b>

# Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>152</b>
Clark	51	5	1	0	0	0	37	94
Schuyler	26	2	0	0	0	1	1	30
Scotland	18	2	0	0	0	0	8	28
<b>2</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>104</b>
Adair	19	13	8	0	0	0	13	53
Knox	6	4	0	0	0	0	4	14
Lewis	10	7	1	0	0	6	13	37
<b>3</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>146</b>
Grundy	25	1	3	0	0	0	33	62
Harrison	20	0	1	0	0	0	10	31
Mercer	4	4	3	0	0	0	5	16
Putnam	21	6	0	0	0	0	10	37
<b>4</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>346</b>
Atchison	7	19	0	0	0	1	13	40
Gentry	12	19	0	0	0	0	4	35
Holt	11	11	0	0	0	0	10	32
Nodaway	41	138	6	0	0	0	50	235
Worth	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	4
<b>5</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>549</b>
Andrew	12	6	3	0	0	0	0	21
Buchanan	229	116	87	2	4	4	86	528
<b>6</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>66</b>
Platte	23	7	4	0	0	0	32	66
<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>32</b>
Clay	1	5	8	0	0	3	15	32
<b>8</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>80</b>
Carroll	7	5	1	0	1	0	4	18
Ray	31	1	12	9	0	0	9	62
<b>9</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>89</b>
Chariton	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	19
Linn	42	3	1	0	0	0	0	46
Sullivan	17	0	0	0	0	0	7	24
<b>10</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>155</b>
Marion	9	56	2	0	0	44	28	139
Monroe	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Ralls	2	5	0	0	0	5	2	14
<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>253</b>
St. Charles	9	3	166	31	0	2	42	253
<b>12</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>400</b>
Audrain	81	23	41	0	0	18	12	175
Montgomery	52	11	4	0	0	24	4	95
Warren	69	11	4	1	0	38	7	130

# Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>13</b>	<b>526</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>889</b>
Boone	452	118	1	0	0	0	48	619
Callaway	74	153	7	0	0	2	34	270
<b>14</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>369</b>
Howard	52	14	3	0	2	0	17	88
Randolph	159	34	26	6	0	0	56	281
<b>15</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>304</b>
Lafayette	49	34	12	9	24	2	18	148
Saline	19	54	7	1	34	0	41	156
<b>16</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>90</b>
Jackson	51	1	23	0	0	8	7	90
<b>17</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>567</b>
Cass	298	12	26	0	0	2	52	390
Johnson	124	25	3	0	0	0	25	177
<b>18</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>222</b>
Cooper	52	20	10	0	0	1	5	88
Pettis	64	21	34	0	0	6	9	134
<b>19</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>179</b>
Cole	42	101	33	0	0	0	3	179
<b>20</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>188</b>
Franklin	73	20	7	0	0	1	64	165
Gasconade	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	13
Osage	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	10
<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>795</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>1,281</b>
St. Louis Co.	23	8	795	137	2	49	267	1,281
<b>22</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>170</b>
St. Louis City	25	0	58	22	0	0	65	170
<b>23</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>614</b>
Jefferson	277	48	156	2	0	0	131	614
<b>24</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>212</b>
Madison	11	1	5	0	0	5	2	24
St. Francois	31	19	6	0	0	42	11	109
Ste. Genevieve	6	4	7	0	0	3	3	23
Washington	2	7	12	0	0	32	3	56
<b>25</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>917</b>
Maries	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	15
Phelps	201	11	26	0	0	0	45	283
Pulaski	180	7	20	1	0	0	69	277
Texas	192	0	19	0	0	0	131	342
<b>26</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>406</b>
Camden	69	8	3	0	0	0	19	99
Laclede	95	11	8	0	0	20	56	190
Miller	17	6	1	3	0	0	23	50
Moniteau	2	9	2	0	0	0	17	30
Morgan	14	4	7	0	0	1	11	37

# Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>27</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>223</b>
Bates	21	10	10	0	0	1	22	64
Benton	8	6	5	0	1	0	4	24
Henry	43	16	18	0	0	1	14	92
St. Clair	16	4	13	0	0	1	9	43
<b>28</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>370</b>
Barton	34	23	9	0	0	0	10	76
Cedar	2	13	22	0	0	0	23	60
Dade	6	4	1	1	0	0	2	14
Vernon	56	99	26	2	0	0	37	220
<b>29</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
Jasper	1	4	3	0	0	2	0	10
<b>30</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>165</b>
Dallas	2	7	4	0	0	1	1	15
Hickory	2	3	4	0	1	1	3	14
Polk	15	12	47	0	1	5	15	95
Webster	37	1	2	0	0	0	1	41
<b>31</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31</b>
Greene	27	3	1	0	0	0	0	31
<b>32</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>707</b>
Bollinger	56	0	1	0	0	0	50	107
Cape Girardeau	61	11	76	4	0	0	290	442
Perry	87	3	10	0	22	0	36	158
<b>33</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>129</b>
Mississippi	17	2	1	0	0	0	2	22
Scott	61	26	6	9	0	0	5	107
<b>34</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>391</b>
New Madrid	83	26	10	0	0	2	24	145
Pemiscot	103	65	14	0	0	2	62	246
<b>35</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>195</b>
Dunklin	1	11	1	0	0	18	24	55
Stoddard	26	17	2	0	0	39	56	140
<b>36</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>97</b>
Carter	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Butler	3	7	77	0	0	0	0	87
Ripley	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	7
<b>37</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>278</b>
Howell	16	27	44	0	0	12	123	222
Oregon	4	3	29	0	1	0	2	39
Shannon	2	5	0	0	0	1	9	17
<b>38</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>570</b>
Christian	512	25	13	0	0	2	18	570

# Appendix I: Status Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Behavior Injurious To Self/Others	Beyond Parental Control	Habitually Absent From Home	Municipal - Curfew	Municipal- Possession/ Use of a Tobacco Product	Status Offense - Other	Truancy	Total
<b>39</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>244</b>
Barry	56	16	9	0	0	0	0	81
Lawrence	53	5	30	0	0	0	0	88
Stone	52	4	19	0	0	0	0	75
<b>40</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>265</b>
McDonald	43	30	9	0	0	3	15	100
Newton	65	40	45	2	0	7	6	165
<b>41</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>172</b>
Macon	47	21	2	0	5	0	55	130
Shelby	14	8	1	0	0	2	17	42
<b>42</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>117</b>
Crawford	4	5	4	0	0	4	3	20
Dent	10	27	0	0	0	0	7	44
Iron	17	10	0	0	0	0	0	27
Reynolds	4	5	0	0	0	1	3	13
Wayne	4	6	0	0	0	3	0	13
<b>43</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>159</b>
Caldwell	8	3	6	0	0	0	7	24
Clinton	19	6	7	0	0	1	4	37
Daviess	6	2	4	0	0	0	8	20
DeKalb	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
Livingston	32	6	22	0	0	0	11	71
<b>44</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>
Douglas	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4
Ozark	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
Wright	2	2	2	0	0	0	3	9
<b>45</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>302</b>
Lincoln	60	9	39	9	1	1	154	273
Pike	12	0	6	1	0	0	10	29
<b>46</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>139</b>
Taney	69	24	40	0	0	1	5	139
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>5,447</b>	<b>1,906</b>	<b>2,373</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>2,852</b>	<b>13,360</b>

## Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Probation/ Parole Violation	Probation Violation	Violation Of Valid Court Order	Total
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Schuyler	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Nodaway	2	2	0	0	0	4
<b>5</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>240</b>
Andrew	14	1	0	0	3	18
Buchanan	189	14	0	0	19	222
<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
Platte	0	0	0	0	3	3
<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Clay						0
<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Ray						0
<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
St. Charles	3	0	0	0	1	4
<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>177</b>
Jackson	0	131	0	0	46	177
<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Cass	0	1	0	0	0	1
Johnson						0
<b>18</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>
Pettis	0	2	0	0	1	3
<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>137</b>
St. Louis Co.	0	0	0	0	137	137
<b>22</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>84</b>
St. Louis City	50	30	0	0	4	84
<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Jefferson						0
<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
Pulaski	0	0	0	2	0	2
<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>
Camden						0
Laclede	0	0	1	1	0	2
Miller						0
Moniteau						0
Morgan						0
<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Bates	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>28</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>
Vernon	5	0	0	0	0	5
<b>30</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>
Dallas	3	1	0	0	0	4
Hickory	1	0	0	0	0	1
Polk	4	1	0	0	0	5
Webster	1	0	0	0	0	1



## Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation</b>	<b>Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation</b>	<b>Probation/ Parole Violation</b>	<b>Probation Violation</b>	<b>Violation Of Valid Court Order</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>33</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>19</b>
Scott	19	0	0	0	0	19
<b>34</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
New Madrid	0	0	2	0	0	2

## Appendix J: Administrative Referrals by Violation, Circuit, and County

Circuit/County	Juvenile Formal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Juvenile Informal Supervision/ Technical Violation	Probation/ Parole Violation	Probation Violation	Violation Of Valid Court Order	Total
Pemiscot	0	0	1	0	0	1
<b>35</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Dunklin	0	0	0	0	1	1
Stoddard	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>37</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>
Howell	2	15	0	0	1	18
<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
Barry	0	0	0	0	2	2
<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>
McDonald	0	0	0	40	0	40
Newton	0	0	0	2	0	2
<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Livingston						0
<b>45</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Lincoln	1	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>761</b>

# Appendix K: Out of Home Placements by Circuit

Circuit	Court Residential Care Cases	Court Residential Care %	DMH Cases	DMH %	CD Cases	CD %	DYS* Cases	DYS* %	Relative Cases	Relative %	Private Agency Cases	Private Agency %	Public Agency Cases	Public Agency %	Other Cases	Other %	Total Cases
1	0	0%	0	0%	21	88%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	24
2	0	0%	0	0%	77	99%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	78
3	0	0%	0	0%	17	65%	4	15%	1	4%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	26
4	1	1%	2	2%	70	78%	2	2%	11	12%	0	0%	0	0%	4	4%	90
5	46	34%	0	0%	56	41%	23	17%	6	4%	1	1%	1	1%	2	1%	135
6	0	0%	0	0%	26	70%	9	24%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	37
7	0	0%	0	0%	77	75%	15	15%	2	2%	0	0%	9	9%	0	0%	103
8	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	3
9	0	0%	0	0%	34	89%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	38
10	0	0%	0	0%	7	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	7
11	0	0%	1	1%	83	72%	21	18%	9	8%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	115
12	5	7%	0	0%	51	74%	3	4%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	5	7%	69
13	1	0%	0	0%	242	95%	2	1%	9	4%	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	256
14	3	2%	1	1%	85	56%	16	11%	45	30%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	152
15	0	0%	0	0%	21	72%	7	24%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	29
16	51	11%	0	0%	366	77%	44	9%	8	2%	3	1%	0	0%	5	1%	477
17	0	0%	1	1%	141	77%	0	0%	3	2%	0	0%	35	19%	2	1%	182
18	0	0%	0	0%	14	82%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	17
19	0	0%	0	0%	42	95%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	44
20	0	0%	0	0%	114	90%	13	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	127
21	0	0%	0	0%	253	83%	30	10%	13	4%	0	0%	0	0%	10	3%	306
22	3	1%	0	0%	340	79%	57	13%	27	6%	3	1%	1	0%	0	0%	431
23	0	0%	0	0%	72	29%	57	23%	114	46%	0	0%	1	0%	3	1%	247
24	0	0%	0	0%	120	81%	21	14%	0	0%	6	4%	0	0%	2	1%	149
25	9	3%	0	0%	172	58%	22	7%	92	31%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	297
26	0	0%	0	0%	44	60%	14	19%	0	0%	0	0%	7	10%	8	11%	73
27	0	0%	2	2%	77	91%	3	4%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	85
28	0	0%	0	0%	69	85%	9	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	2%	81
29	1	1%	0	0%	126	79%	16	10%	14	9%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	160
30	0	0%	0	0%	84	82%	5	5%	9	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3	3%	102
31	2	1%	1	0%	250	69%	4	1%	70	19%	2	1%	31	9%	4	1%	364
32	0	0%	0	0%	48	81%	11	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	59
33	0	0%	0	0%	44	61%	15	21%	2	3%	0	0%	3	4%	8	11%	72
34	0	0%	0	0%	119	81%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	26	18%	1	1%	147
35	1	1%	0	0%	132	94%	8	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	141
36	1	1%	1	1%	96	61%	16	10%	35	22%	0	0%	0	0%	8	5%	157
37	1	2%	0	0%	50	86%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	4	7%	58
38	0	0%	0	0%	76	62%	40	33%	4	3%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	122
39	1	1%	0	0%	107	90%	2	2%	6	5%	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	119
40	2	1%	0	0%	79	58%	9	7%	43	32%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	136
41	0	0%	0	0%	24	89%	0	0%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	27
42	0	0%	0	0%	164	98%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	167
43	0	0%	0	0%	84	87%	3	3%	0	0%	3	3%	6	6%	1	1%	97
44	1	3%	0	0%	33	92%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	36
45	0	0%	0	0%	62	76%	13	16%	6	7%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	82
46	0	0%	0	0%	124	91%	13	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	137
Total	129	2%	9	0%	4,394	75%	540	9%	543	9%	28	0%	133	2%	85	1%	5,861

\*Might not match DYS Commitment Counts

Department of Mental Health (DMH), Children's Division (CD), and Division of Youth Services (DYS)

# Appendix L: In Home Services by Circuit

Circuit	Supervision By Court Cases	Supervision By Court %	DMH Cases	DMH %	CD Cases	CD %	DYS Cases	DYS %	Private Agency Cases	Private Agency %	Public Agency Cases	Public Agency %	Other Cases	Other %	Total Cases
1	54	56%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%	0	0%	7	7%	32	33%	96
2	89	61%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	53	36%	1	1%	3	2%	147
3	61	62%	0	0%	35	36%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	98
4	164	66%	21	8%	9	4%	0	0%	18	7%	26	10%	10	4%	248
5	522	98%	0	0%	7	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	530
6	161	84%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	31	16%	192
7	165	99%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	166
8	18	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	18
9	10	59%	0	0%	7	41%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	17
10	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1
11	369	52%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	249	35%	78	11%	7	1%	704
12	106	69%	5	3%	24	16%	0	0%	9	6%	6	4%	4	3%	154
13	331	99%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	335
14	23	70%	0	0%	9	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	33
15	33	92%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	36
16	155	90%	0	0%	13	8%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	172
17	381	98%	1	0%	8	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	390
18	26	55%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	18	38%	0	0%	0	0%	47
19	3	27%	0	0%	7	64%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	11
20	76	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	76
21	127	90%	2	1%	7	5%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	141
22	157	98%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	1	1%	161
23	318	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	318
24	47	77%	14	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	61
25	44	86%	0	0%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3	6%	0	0%	51
26	29	97%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	30
27	111	61%	22	12%	34	19%	0	0%	5	3%	4	2%	5	3%	181
28	53	80%	0	0%	11	17%	0	0%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	66
29	27	63%	0	0%	15	35%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	43
30	53	85%	0	0%	8	13%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	62
31	72	87%	0	0%	10	12%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	83
32	42	62%	0	0%	25	37%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	68
33	65	67%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	29	30%	1	1%	97
34	40	70%	4	7%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	9	16%	57
35	229	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	229
36	71	35%	0	0%	10	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	120	60%	201
37	63	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	63
38	133	83%	0	0%	20	12%	0	0%	3	2%	2	1%	3	2%	161
39	40	74%	2	4%	10	19%	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	54
40	99	97%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	102
41	27	79%	1	3%	4	12%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	34
42	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
43	18	60%	0	0%	9	30%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	30
44	12	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	12
45	26	96%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	27
46	59	83%	0	0%	9	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	3%	71
Total	4,710	80%	77	1%	311	5%	9	0%	364	6%	163	3%	240	4%	5,874
Department of Mental Health (DMH), Children's Division (CD), and Division of Youth Services (DYS)															

# Appendix M: Commitments to DYS by Circuit, Race, and Gender

Circuit	White Male	White Female	Black Male	Black Female	Hispanic Male	Hispanic Female	Native American Male	Native American Female	Asian / Pacific Islander Male	Asian / Pacific Islander Female	Total
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
5	9	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	16
6	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
7	4	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	11
8	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
10	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
11	7	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
13	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
14	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
15	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
16	3	1	15	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	22
17	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
18	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
19	1	1	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
20	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
21	2	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
22	1	1	48	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	57
23	18	6	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	29
24	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
25	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
26	8	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
27	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
28	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
29	10	1	6	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	25
30	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8
31	11	3	5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	21
32	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
33	7	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
34	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
35	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
36	5	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
37	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
38	13	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
39	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
40	4	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
41	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
42											0
43	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
44	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
45	6	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
46	9	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Total	231	57	158	25	20	5	0	0	0	0	496

## Appendix N: Certification to Adult Court by Circuit, Race, and Gender

<b>Circuit</b>	<b>White Male</b>	<b>White Female</b>	<b>Black Male</b>	<b>Black Female</b>	<b>Hispanic Male</b>	<b>Hispanic Female</b>	<b>Other Male</b>	<b>Other Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>3</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>5</b>	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	<b>4</b>
<b>7</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>9</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>11</b>	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	<b>6</b>
<b>13</b>	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	<b>5</b>
<b>16</b>	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	<b>7</b>
<b>17</b>	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
<b>18</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>19</b>	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>21</b>	2	0	16	1	0	0	0	0	<b>19</b>
<b>22</b>	0	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	<b>18</b>
<b>24</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>25</b>	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	<b>4</b>
<b>27</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>28</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>30</b>	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>31</b>	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	<b>4</b>
<b>32</b>	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>33</b>	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>34</b>	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
<b>35</b>	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
<b>39</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>40</b>	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>43</b>	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>45</b>	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>97</b>

**Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>82%</b>
Clark	24	20	83%
Schuyler	5	4	80%
Scotland	4	3	75%
<b>2</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>93%</b>
Adair	57	52	91%
Knox	7	7	100%
Lewis	42	40	95%
<b>3</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>80%</b>
Grundy	58	41	71%
Harrison	27	26	96%
Mercer	0	0	NA
Putnam	14	12	86%
<b>4</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>95%</b>
Atchison	3	3	100%
Gentry	17	17	100%
Holt	0	0	NA
Nodaway	84	79	94%
Worth	2	2	100%
<b>5</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>62%</b>
Andrew	32	17	53%
Buchanan	299	188	63%
<b>6</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>85%</b>
Platte	285	241	85%
<b>7</b>	<b>512</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>52%</b>
Clay	512	268	52%
<b>8</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>58%</b>
Carroll	7	7	100%
Ray	48	25	52%
<b>9</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>59%</b>
Chariton	0	0	NA
Linn	39	23	59%
Sullivan	7	4	57%
<b>10</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>95%</b>
Marion	169	159	94%
Monroe	6	6	100%
Ralls	32	32	100%
<b>11</b>	<b>987</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>56%</b>
St. Charles	987	554	56%

**Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>78%</b>
Audrain	99	75	76%
Montgomery	52	44	85%
Warren	125	95	76%
<b>13</b>	<b>852</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>70%</b>
Boone	658	493	75%
Callaway	194	107	55%
<b>14</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>48%</b>
Howard	23	12	52%
Randolph	83	39	47%
<b>15</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>63%</b>
Lafayette	233	160	69%
Saline	149	80	54%
<b>16</b>	<b>1,285</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>47%</b>
Jackson	1,285	598	47%
<b>17</b>	<b>705</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>69%</b>
Cass	540	354	66%
Johnson	165	134	81%
<b>18</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>82%</b>
Cooper	181	177	98%
Pettis	176	117	66%
<b>19</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>77%</b>
Cole	291	223	77%
<b>20</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>57%</b>
Franklin	344	200	58%
Gasconade	34	20	59%
Osage	27	9	33%
<b>21</b>	<b>3,587</b>	<b>2,169</b>	<b>60%</b>
St. Louis Co.	3,587	2,169	60%
<b>22</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>823</b>	<b>84%</b>
St. Louis City	980	823	84%
<b>23</b>	<b>883</b>	<b>543</b>	<b>61%</b>
Jefferson	883	543	61%
<b>24</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>79%</b>
Madison	31	30	97%
St. Francois	303	232	77%
St. Genevieve	43	38	88%
Washington	12	7	58%



**Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>79%</b>
Maries	8	3	38%
Phelps	140	105	75%
Pulaski	217	187	86%
Texas	38	25	66%
<b>26</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>65%</b>
Camden	100	78	78%
Laclede	136	59	43%
Miller	109	81	74%
Moniteau	25	15	60%
Morgan	46	36	78%
<b>27</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>69%</b>
Bates	45	32	71%
Benton	29	20	69%
Henry	26	15	58%
St. Clair	47	35	74%
<b>28</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>86%</b>
Barton	35	26	74%
Cedar	95	83	87%
Dade	32	29	91%
Vernon	165	144	87%
<b>29</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>87%</b>
Jasper	120	104	87%
<b>30</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>100%</b>
Dallas	38	38	100%
Hickory	29	29	100%
Polk	211	211	100%
Webster	138	138	100%
<b>31</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>61%</b>
Greene	384	235	61%
<b>32</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>76%</b>
Bollinger	24	23	96%
Cape Girardeau	313	223	71%
Perry	42	42	100%
<b>33</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>93%</b>
Mississippi	59	54	92%
Scott	244	228	93%
<b>34</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>99%</b>
New Madrid	35	35	100%
Pemiscot	148	146	99%
<b>35</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>87%</b>
Dunklin	99	66	67%
Stoddard	185	182	98%

**Appendix O: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Delinquency Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>36</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>1</b>
Carter	23	19	83%
Butler	273	209	77%
Ripley	24	17	71%
<b>37</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>83%</b>
Howell	169	141	83%
Oregon	34	30	88%
Shannon	14	9	64%
<b>38</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>66%</b>
Christian	288	189	66%
<b>39</b>	<b>338</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>66%</b>
Barry	96	57	59%
Lawrence	117	90	77%
Stone	125	76	61%
<b>40</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>78%</b>
McDonald	185	155	84%
Newton	210	154	73%
<b>41</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>84%</b>
Macon	41	35	85%
Shelby	22	18	82%
<b>42</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>90%</b>
Crawford	24	24	100%
Dent	5	5	100%
Iron	5	5	100%
Reynolds	9	8	89%
Wayne	9	5	56%
<b>43</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>84%</b>
Caldwell	28	19	68%
Clinton	29	25	86%
Daviess	24	18	75%
DeKalb	10	9	90%
Livingston	131	115	88%
<b>44</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>93%</b>
Douglas	11	11	100%
Ozark	9	9	100%
Wright	60	54	90%
<b>45</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>44%</b>
Lincoln	271	115	42%
Pike	27	15	56%
<b>46</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>58%</b>
Taney	225	131	58%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>19,125</b>	<b>13,103</b>	<b>69%</b>

**Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>99%</b>
Clark	94	92	98%
Schuyler	28	28	100%
Scotland	31	31	100%
<b>2</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>98%</b>
Adair	68	66	97%
Knox	21	21	100%
Lewis	43	43	100%
<b>3</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>94%</b>
Grundy	62	55	89%
Harrison	33	31	94%
Mercer	16	16	100%
Putnam	37	37	100%
<b>4</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>97%</b>
Atchison	17	14	82%
Gentry	29	28	97%
Holt	10	10	100%
Nodaway	203	199	98%
Worth	1	0	0%
<b>5</b>	<b>816</b>	<b>721</b>	<b>88%</b>
Andrew	42	33	79%
Buchanan	774	688	89%
<b>6</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>77%</b>
Platte	105	81	77%
<b>7</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>78%</b>
Clay	45	35	78%
<b>8</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>72%</b>
Carroll	17	13	76%
Ray	66	47	71%
<b>9</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>79%</b>
Chariton	19	13	68%
Linn	47	35	74%
Sullivan	32	29	91%
<b>10</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>98%</b>
Marion	147	143	97%
Monroe	5	5	100%
Ralls	18	18	100%
<b>11</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>70%</b>
St. Charles	294	206	70%
<b>12</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>82%</b>
Audrain	188	148	79%
Montgomery	101	85	84%
Warren	111	95	86%

**Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>650</b>	<b>66%</b>
Boone	716	501	70%
Callaway	262	149	57%
<b>14</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>57%</b>
Howard	62	41	66%
Randolph	247	136	55%
<b>15</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>67%</b>
Lafayette	89	65	73%
Saline	235	151	64%
<b>16</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>66%</b>
Jackson	47	31	66%
<b>17</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>77%</b>
Cass	371	275	74%
Johnson	174	145	83%
<b>18</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>92%</b>
Cooper	93	92	99%
Pettis	130	113	87%
<b>19</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>78%</b>
Cole	185	145	78%
<b>20</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>69%</b>
Franklin	161	110	68%
Gasconade	12	10	83%
Osage	7	4	57%
<b>21</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>77%</b>
St. Louis Co.	1,247	959	77%
<b>22</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>79%</b>
St. Louis City	246	194	79%
<b>23</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>75%</b>
Jefferson	566	427	75%
<b>24</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>79%</b>
Madison	23	21	91%
St. Francois	113	96	85%
St. Genevieve	29	27	93%
Washington	54	28	52%
<b>25</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>781</b>	<b>87%</b>
Maries	16	12	75%
Phelps	267	208	78%
Pulaski	272	228	84%
Texas	343	333	97%

**Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>70%</b>
Camden	96	85	89%
Laclede	227	139	61%
Miller	55	41	75%
Moniteau	42	26	62%
Morgan	35	28	80%
<b>27</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>80%</b>
Bates	64	53	83%
Benton	27	22	81%
Henry	82	63	77%
St. Clair	51	41	80%
<b>28</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>88%</b>
Barton	75	70	93%
Cedar	66	60	91%
Dade	18	15	83%
Vernon	230	199	87%
<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>82%</b>
Jasper	11	9	82%
<b>30</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>100%</b>
Dallas	20	20	100%
Hickory	15	15	100%
Polk	100	100	100%
Webster	43	43	100%
<b>31</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>81%</b>
Greene	26	21	81%
<b>32</b>	<b>676</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>92%</b>
Bollinger	104	104	100%
Cape Girardeau	423	369	87%
Perry	149	146	98%
<b>33</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>96%</b>
Mississippi	25	20	80%
Scott	123	122	99%
<b>34</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>97%</b>
New Madrid	166	166	100%
Pemiscot	265	253	95%
<b>35</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>92%</b>
Dunklin	100	80	80%
Stoddard	142	142	100%
<b>36</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>95%</b>
Carter	3	1	33%
Butler	83	81	98%
Ripley	6	5	83%

**Appendix P: Standard 2.3 Preliminary Inquiry of Status Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>37</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>85%</b>
Howell	228	190	83%
Oregon	41	40	98%
Shannon	13	10	77%
<b>38</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>75%</b>
Christian	592	445	75%
<b>39</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>79%</b>
Barry	94	72	77%
Lawrence	105	85	81%
Stone	91	73	80%
<b>40</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>86%</b>
McDonald	112	102	91%
Newton	178	146	82%
<b>41</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>91%</b>
Macon	121	111	92%
Shelby	41	37	90%
<b>42</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>99%</b>
Crawford	16	16	100%
Dent	11	11	100%
Iron	36	36	100%
Reynolds	6	5	83%
Wayne	10	10	100%
<b>43</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>87%</b>
Caldwell	20	14	70%
Clinton	46	40	87%
Daviess	21	15	71%
DeKalb	8	6	75%
Livingston	62	61	98%
<b>44</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>95%</b>
Douglas	6	6	100%
Ozark	5	5	100%
Wright	10	9	90%
<b>45</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>77%</b>
Lincoln	275	219	80%
Pike	38	23	61%
<b>46</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>73%</b>
Taney	143	104	73%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>13,872</b>	<b>11,276</b>	<b>81%</b>

**Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>98%</b>
Clark	57	55	96%
Schuyler	20	20	100%
Scotland	10	10	100%
<b>2</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100%</b>
Adair	78	78	100%
Knox	7	7	100%
Lewis	17	17	100%
<b>3</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>98%</b>
Grundy	88	87	99%
Harrison	35	34	97%
Mercer	5	4	80%
Putnam	19	19	100%
<b>4</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>99%</b>
Atchison	17	17	100%
Gentry	19	19	100%
Holt	19	19	100%
Nodaway	67	66	99%
Worth	0	0	NA
<b>5</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>98%</b>
Andrew	6	6	100%
Buchanan	125	122	98%
<b>6</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>
Platte	33	33	100%
<b>7</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>63%</b>
Clay	437	277	63%
<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>54%</b>
Carroll	1	1	100%
Ray	12	6	50%
<b>9</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>97%</b>
Chariton	22	22	100%
Linn	23	23	100%
Sullivan	29	27	93%
<b>10</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>71%</b>
Marion	40	28	70%
Monroe	6	4	67%
Ralls	3	3	100%
<b>11</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>94%</b>
St. Charles	118	111	94%
<b>12</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>88%</b>
Audrain	50	44	88%
Montgomery	47	38	81%
Warren	73	67	92%
<b>13</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>90%</b>
Boone	186	178	96%
Callaway	104	84	81%

**Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>46%</b>
Howard	24	14	58%
Randolph	104	45	43%
<b>15</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>72%</b>
Lafayette	20	16	80%
Saline	16	10	63%
<b>16</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>702</b>	<b>84%</b>
Jackson	838	702	84%
<b>17</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>74%</b>
Cass	262	180	69%
Johnson	90	82	91%
<b>18</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>82%</b>
Cooper	37	35	95%
Pettis	40	28	70%
<b>19</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>94%</b>
Cole	68	64	94%
<b>20</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>99%</b>
Franklin	97	97	100%
Gasconade	18	17	94%
Osage	3	3	100%
<b>21</b>	<b>770</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>82%</b>
St. Louis Co.	770	630	82%
<b>22</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>81%</b>
St. Louis City	537	435	81%
<b>23</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>100%</b>
Jefferson	630	627	100%
<b>24</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>85%</b>
Madison	30	30	100%
St. Francois	71	69	97%
St. Genevieve	9	9	100%
Washington	48	27	56%
<b>25</b>	<b>1,216</b>	<b>1,108</b>	<b>91%</b>
Maries	28	22	79%
Phelps	376	323	86%
Pulaski	526	483	92%
Texas	286	280	98%
<b>26</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>84%</b>
Camden	113	109	96%
Laclede	139	108	78%
Miller	86	77	90%
Moniteau	7	5	71%
Morgan	55	35	64%



**Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>90%</b>
Bates	123	113	92%
Benton	52	44	85%
Henry	118	106	90%
St. Clair	48	45	94%
<b>28</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>94%</b>
Barton	39	37	95%
Cedar	52	50	96%
Dade	22	21	95%
Vernon	76	69	91%
<b>29</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>99%</b>
Jasper	161	159	99%
<b>30</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>99%</b>
Dallas	45	44	98%
Hickory	11	11	100%
Polk	111	111	100%
Webster	184	183	99%
<b>31</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>100%</b>
Greene	424	424	100%
<b>32</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>93%</b>
Bollinger	23	23	100%
Cape Girardeau	259	258	100%
Perry	84	58	69%
<b>33</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>100%</b>
Mississippi	15	15	100%
Scott	39	39	100%
<b>34</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>100%</b>
New Madrid	82	82	100%
Pemiscot	124	123	99%
<b>35</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>90%</b>
Dunklin	92	54	59%
Stoddard	291	290	100%
<b>36</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>96%</b>
Carter	14	14	100%
Butler	195	187	96%
Ripley	36	34	94%
<b>37</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100%</b>
Howell	74	74	100%
Oregon	9	9	100%
Shannon	15	15	100%
<b>38</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>57%</b>
Christian	187	107	57%
<b>39</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>93%</b>
Barry	160	153	96%
Lawrence	72	69	96%
Stone	59	50	85%

**Appendix Q: Standard 4.3 Preliminary Inquiry of CA/N Referrals  
within a Thirty Day Time Period**

<b>Circuit/County</b>	<b>Total Referrals Filed</b>	<b>Standard Met</b>	<b>Percent Standard Met</b>
<b>40</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>99%</b>
McDonald	89	88	99%
Newton	164	163	99%
<b>41</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>86%</b>
Macon	20	15	75%
Shelby	15	15	100%
<b>42</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>99%</b>
Crawford	48	48	100%
Dent	31	30	97%
Iron	38	38	100%
Reynolds	21	21	100%
Wayne	16	16	100%
<b>43</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>100%</b>
Caldwell	10	10	100%
Clinton	21	21	100%
Daviess	30	30	100%
DeKalb	14	14	100%
Livingston	181	180	99%
<b>44</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>58%</b>
Douglas	20	6	30%
Ozark	12	7	58%
Wright	27	21	78%
<b>45</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>87%</b>
Lincoln	271	238	88%
Pike	27	21	78%
<b>46</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>99%</b>
Taney	182	181	99%
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>11,634</b>	<b>10,322</b>	<b>89%</b>

## Appendix R: 2023 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Referrals Black	Referrals Hispanic	Referrals Asian	Cases Diverted Black	Cases Diverted Hispanic	Cases Diverted Asian	Secure Detention Black	Secure Detention Hispanic	Secure Detention Asian	Cases Petitioned Black	Cases Petitioned Hispanic	Cases Petitioned Asian
Adair	3.92											
Andrew	5.29											
Audrain	3.79											
Barry												
Boone	9.57		0.22	0.84			1.94			1.52		
Buchanan	2.55	0.64	0.52									
Butler	4.51									1.96		
Callaway	3.26									0.41		
Cape Girardeau	8.35	3.15								2.29		
Cass	2.81	0.63					2.16			1.64		
Christian	1.99	0.38								2.31		
Clay	2.74											
Cole	5.83			0.77			2.97			1.98		
Cooper	5.76									3.62		
Dunklin	2.60											
Franklin	2.23											
Greene	4.52											
Grundy		2.07										
Henry	3.31											
Howard	3.42											
Howell	4.42											
Jackson	4.38	0.39		0.70			1.40			1.72		
Jasper	3.78											
Jefferson	4.01	0.52										
Johnson	3.52	0.42										
Laclede	2.64											
Lafayette	3.24											
Lawrence	2.76											
Lewis	2.50											
Lincoln	2.32	0.36								3.05		
Livingston	1.71											
Macon	2.84											
Marion	1.68											
McDonald		0.70										
Miller	4.60											
Mississippi	3.01											
Morgan	9.24											
New Madrid	2.32											
Newton		0.67										
Pemiscot	2.92	1.81										
Pettis	3.90											
Phelps	2.85											
Pike	3.92	3.26										
Platte	4.76									3.48		
Polk	2.24											
Pulaski	2.28	0.32	0.33									
Ray	8.60											
Saline	2.12	0.45	5.85									
Scott	3.21											
St. Charles	5.51						3.16			2.51		
St. Francois	2.62											
St. Louis County	5.31			0.88			2.78			4.07		
St. Louis City*	5.33/ -734			.88/ 91			1.40/ -52			1.35/ -55		
Taney	2.74	0.50										
Texas	2.29											
Vernon	4.28											
Warren	3.75											

\* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

\*\* If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.

Key: RRI/ PARITY

# Appendix R: 2023 Relative Rate Indices by County - All Offenses

County	Delinquent Findings Black	Delinquent Findings Hispanic	Delinquent Findings Asian	Supervision Black	Supervision Hispanic	Supervision Asian	Secure Confinement Black	Secure Confinement Hispanic	Secure Confinement Asian
Audrain									
Boone									
Buchanan									
Butler									
Callaway									
Camden									
Cape Girardeau									
Cass									
Christian									
Clay									
Cole									
Cooper									
Dunklin									
Franklin									
Greene									
Henry									
Howard									
Howell									
Jackson				1.38			0.46		
Jasper									
Jefferson									
Johnson									
Laclede									
Lafayette									
Lewis									
Lincoln									
Livingston									
Macon									
Marion									
Mississippi									
Montgomery									
New Madrid									
Pemiscot									
Pettis									
Phelps									
Pike									
Platte									
Pulaski									
Randolph									
Ray									
St. Charles				0.59			2.23		
St. Francois									
St. Louis County									
St. Louis City*									
Saline									
Scott									
Stoddard									
Taney									
Texas									
Warren									

\* The statistical parity numbers for the City of St. Louis are included for reference only, since Black youth represent the largest demographic group.

\*\* If the RRI is blank, this means it was not statistically significant.